STATE LIBRARY OF PENNSYLVANIA
main,stks 205Ev13
Lutheran quarterly.
v.17 1887 Lutheran quarterly
0 0001 00658519 2

REFERENCE

PENNSYLVANIA STATE LIBRARY
1745

COLLECTIONS

04-79-785-8

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

https://archive.org/details/vol17lutheranqua00luth

THE

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

EDITED BY

E. J. WOLF, D. D., AND P. M. BIKLÉ, PH. D.

WITH THE SPECIAL CO-OPERATION OF

M. VALENTINE, D. D., LL. D.

NEW SERIES—VOL. XVII.

GETTYSBURG:
J. E. WIBLE, STEAM PRINTER, CARLISLE STREET (SECOND SQUARE).
1887.

INDEX TO VOL. XVII.

Albert, Dr. C. S., Art. by, 248.
Alleman, Dr. B. F., Art. by, 279.
A Penny a Day, 102.
Artist, Christian, Mission of, 540.
Augsburg Confession, Art. I., 457.
Baugher, Dr. H. L., Art. by, 273.
Beauty Reconsidered, 1.
Beneficiary Education, 60.
Biklé, Prof. P. M., Art. by, 60.
Book Notices, 123, 299, 437, 605.
Bossuet, 27.
Buddhism, Esoteric, 381.
Bushnell, Rev. J. E., Art. by, 293.
Catechism, Dr. Conrad's, 259.
Catechism, Requisites of a Good, 226.
Church, The, and the Labor Problem, 248.
Conrad, Dr. F. W., Art. by, 157.
Conrad's, Dr., Catechism, 259.
Cromer, Rev. J. M., Art. by, 288.
Dr. Hodge on the Person of Christ, 410.
Duty of the Church to Supply an Adequate Ministry, 396.
Earnest, Rev. J. A., Art. by, 261.
Educating Men for the Ministry, 60.
Elements of Success in Preaching, 157.
Eschatology as Taught by Our Lord, 88.
Esoteric Buddhism, 381.
Fenelon, 502.
Final Judgment, The, 206.
Fox, Dr. L. A., Art. by, 206.
Fundamental Principles of the General Council, 515.
General Council, Fundamental Principles of, 515.
Grounds of Heathen Salvation, 170.
Haithcox, Rev. H. C., Art. by, 353.
Hall, Rev. H. H., Arts. by, 27, 502.
Hall, Rev. Wm., Art. by, 427.
Hay, Dr. C. A., Art. by, 259.
Heathen Salvation, The Grounds of, 170.
Holloway, Dr. H. C., Art. by, 396.
Holman Lecture, 457.
In What does the Universal Priesthood of Believers Consist? 360.
Judgment, The Final, 206.
Koller, Dr. J. C., Art. by, 264.
Labor Question, The, 102, 248.
Language Study, 79.
Lewars, Rev. W. H., Art. by, 360.
Licensure, Premature, 371.
Literary Intelligence, 118, 297, 436, 604.
Lutheran Origin of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Anglican Church, 483.
Luther before the Diet of Worms, 309.
Lutheran Catechism, Requisites of a Good, 226, 259.
Luther's Small Catechism Explained by Dr. Conrad, 259.
Marquis, Dr. D. C., Art. by, 88.
McMackin, Rev. A. B., Art. by, 40.

81720

Midland College—The Ground of its Claim, 589.
Ministerial Supply, 188, 396.
Ministry, Educating Men for the, 60, 396.
Mission of the Christian Artist, 540.
Morris, Dr. J. G., Art. by, 483.
Nehemiah, 40.
Notes on the "Te Deum," 293.
Notices of New Publications, 123, 299, 437, 605.
Old Testament Discussion, Problems of, 335.
Ort, Dr. S. A., Art. by, 457.
Painter, Prof. F. V. N., Art. by, 79.
Parson, Rev. W. E., Art. by, 381.
Person of Christ, Dr. Hodge on the, 410.
Preaching, Elements of Success in, 157.
Premature Licensure, 371.
Priesthood of Believers, 360.
Problems of Old Testament Discussion, 335.
Prohibition, 353.
Recent Educational Movements in their Relation to Language Study, 79.
Requisites of a Good Lutheran Catechism, 226, 259.
Rhodes, Dr. M., Art. by, 589.
Richard, Dr. J. W., Art. by, 410.
Richards, Prof. M. H., Art. by, 102.
Rupp, Rev. J. C. F., Art. by, 170.
Salvation, Heathen, 170.
Schaff, Dr. P., Art. by, 309.
Schodde, Dr. G. H., Art. by, 335.
Schwarm, Rev. S., Art. by, 555.
Seyffarth, The Late Gustavus, 427.
Sheeleigh, Dr. M., Art. by, 371.
Stuckenberg, Mrs., Art. by, 571.
Symposiac, A, 259.
Temperance Question, The, as an Economic Issue, 555.
Te Deum, Notes on the, 293.
The Late Gustavus Seyffarth, 427.
The Trinity, 457.
The Work and the Workers, 188.
Thirty-Nine Articles of the Anglican Church, 483.
Thoughts on Woman's Education, 571.
Traver, Rev. Allen, Art. by, 540.
Valentine, Dr. M., Art. by, 515.
Wedekind, Dr. A. C., Art. by, 268.
Wenner, Rev. G. U., Art. by, 271.
Wolf, Dr. E. J., Arts. by, 188, 282.
Woman's Education, Thoughts on, 571.
Wynn, Dr. W. H., Art. by, 1.
Ziegler, Dr. H., Art. by, 226.

THE

QUARTERLY REVIEW

OF

THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

JANUARY, 1887.

ARTICLE I.

BEAUTY RECONSIDERED.

By PROF. W. H. WYNN, PH. D., Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.

It was Plato who first enunciated the doctrine of absolute beauty, of beauty, that is, in its far-off aboriginal source. That poet-philosopher meditated every deepest subject of human research in a halo of beauty; and it may be said of him that despite his crotchet against the fine arts, the æsthetic glory of the Greek mind rose to its zenith in him. He saw, as we all now steadily see, notwithstanding persistent attempts in certain quarters to disturb this conviction, that the universe is everywhere wrapped round with a photosphere of beauty; that all being is pervaded by it; and that it has its primitive sources in the very essence of things.

He identified the beautiful and the good, and invented the single word καλοκἀγαθία to express the coalescing ideas. They are one; but, as we shall see, no more than the beautiful and the true, except that in the ordinary conception these two may be made to draw apart in apparent isolation and divorce. Human thinking may be cold and jejune, yet true, rising like a crystal palace in a region of snow. But in this case the mind is at fault, and the common instinct of men immediately detects the offense and grieves that the truth should be robbed of its inde-

feasible glow. This indefinable, impalpable, something that breaks in waves of enthusiasm over all lines of scientific pursuit, like the pulsing of heat over fields of grain, is beauty; and it is the healthful attitude of the intellect to look for it everywhere under the sun.

A thing of beauty is a joy forever, because its forever of perdurance is determined by the eternity of its source. Or, to speak more plainly, beauty, like the good and the true, is traceable to a home in the Infinite, out of which it comes with every creative process as undeviatingly as it is in the purpose of every plant, in the course of its development, to bloom. In spite of the difficulty of defining one or other of these great matters—the good, and the beautiful, and the true—the common consciousness feels their existence none the less powerfully, and instinctively discerns that, somehow, they lie inseparably together in the primitive order of things. Think of the measureless domain over which these three, by joint royalty, are supreme. All natural objects, and all human interests are comprehensively bound up in this three-fold generalization of the good, the beautiful, and the true.

These are realities, not names. They express simply the relations in which things normally exist, worlds, cosmic forces, society, souls. Where the one is, the others will be also, although as a matter of fact, through the force of circumstances or the allotments of history, we shall always find one or other of them exalted to a place of absorbing rank. At one supreme moment in the history of the Greeks it was the beautiful; further on it was the true. In Roman civilization it was never the beautiful, rather the sternest aspects of the true, until the Romano-Gothic genius of the Middle Age essayed the task of expressing the infinite in the climbing archways and thousand spires of the Gothic cathedral. When the Renaissance came in it was a double stream of the beautiful flooding Italy, and propagating itself to the less genial climes of the North—a double stream, the recovered pagan antique mingling with the new-born Christian art. And then, finally, when the religious Reformation had broken in upon the warring nationalities of modern Europe, and the great Germanic peoples were to take the lead

of the world, it was inevitable, both from the nature of the movement, and from the supremely secular character of the times in which it originated, that the aesthetic impulse should shrink into the back ground, and that men should be wholly absorbed in the good and the true. But if we look a little deeper into these shifting epochs of sentiment, we shall find everywhere the same jewel with one or other of its three facets conspicuously in view. The trinity of elements is never dissolved; because it is essential to human life in all phases of its development that it should feel the good, enjoy the beautiful, and perceive the true.

We may tarry here one moment to assure ourselves that the three modes of spiritual activity are at bottom one. The good we know by that movement of the soul we call love. What a man loves is good to him, even if it be bad to all the world beside. His love, the prompting of that inmost yearning of his nature, is, we may say, always in the direction of some good, an infallible index that something of intrinsic value is within his reach. It may, indeed, happen that the object toward which the love is directed is a low one, and in its isolated and relative aspect an unworthy one; as, for example, where the love, fixed supremely on animal gratification, degenerates into lust. But the appetite within rational limits is good, and the object on which it fixes in like manner good—and these lose their rank of value only when made to absorb the entire spiritual energy of the soul. There is a hierarchy of goods. And always it is true that the thing that is good in itself, and in due subordination serves its end, becoming insubordinate, is metamorphosed into the bad. So, now, as love in its far-off fountains is an emotion, an impulse, a yearning toward that which is good, and has at first no knowledge of any scale of values, it must be subject to the discipline of life and to a large spiritual tutelage, in which the good will be intellectualized and defined out into the true.

The true, then, is but the propositional shape in which the good articulates itself in conscious manifestation to the thinking mind. I call that in formula true which in substance I feel to be good. And so the emotional nature is constantly swelling out in the bloom and fruitage of the intellect, in proportion as

the indeterminate love-movement of the soul gets itself definitely outlined in thought. It is, indeed, not without reason that some of our profoundest philosophers speak of emotion as inchoate or obscure thought, since our closest introspection into every phase of conscious movement in the soul reveals the thinking process already begun. So far as we are able to observe, the dawn of sentiment is coeval with the first faintest stirrings of the impulses that are not automatic and blind; and where sentiment is, there, only, can a conscious susceptibility to beauty exist. Beauty, at least subjectively considered, as it dwells in your mind and mine, always implies sentiment, and this means that the emotion has somewhere visibly risen on the horizon of thought.

But there is something more. If we were limited in our inner energy and experience to this mere process of elaborating and defining our emotions in the clear light of the intellect, there might fall to us large and affluent treasures of truth, but no beauty—no! not even truth in reality, for beauty is the inseparable *aura* that goes with the truth. The good and the true are bathed in this as in their native air. And it is not of the truth alone that the poet is speaking when he asks:

> "But what delights can equal those
> That stir the spirit's inner deeps,
> When he that loves, but knows not, reaps
> A truth from him who loves and knows?"

—it is that pervasive enjoyment that goes with discovery kindled always by "the splendor of the true." If we had some warmer word than this, some genial title that would suggest a blood temperature to the truth, which might shrink and chill and freeze out in uncongenial latitudes, this would supply our lacking vocabulary with the very definition of beauty we are so eager to have. It is the warm pulsing splendors of the true, as of the Grail, blood-red and beating, moving on a sunbeam in our nether world.

Seeking for it on the outside of us, in the objective world, we are always conscious of something incommensurably larger than facts, vaster than the myriad statistics with which the universe is crowded, something, somehow, in closest sympathy with our

living selves, and toward which we leap with spontaneous enjoyment be it the good or the true. But, now, in our effort to escape the speculative entanglements in which this subject is usually involved, we seem to be wandering off with it into a region of mist. Is it simply a vague species of enjoyment, of a higher kind it is true than that which mere animal life can supply, but enjoyment nevertheless, and so, therefore, subject to the varying fortunes of time and caprice?

Let us be clear on this point. For in our day when the realistic schools are in the ascendant, and all things ideal are supposed to be suffering "a sea-change" into something incomparably rare at least, beauty is in great danger of losing her old-time prerogatives, her divinity so to speak, and of coming to be reckoned the mere pleasurable product of the shifting sensibilities of men. When physiology shall absorb aesthetics, and heredity and environment shall be regarded as an adequate solution for every mystery hitherto unwittingly thought to be pressing upon us from the eternal world, of course all this Platonic reverie about the good, the beautiful, and the true, that has in fact inspired all the grandest achievements of artistic and poetic genius in ancient and modern times, becomes mere sentiment, and all talk about it is ridiculously out of date. If beauty is a thing of pure sensibility, even if we allow it the subtle accumulations of a slow-moving process of evolution, whereby that which was simply familiar and agreeable at first came to be invested with special mystical properties—then the illusion is gone, and there is no use of attempting to "insure Olympus," for there is no Olympus to insure. Enjoyment resting wholly on the sensibility, even if it be ever so much refined, is mundane and crass; and it is not likely that the devotee awaiting the inspirations of something supersensible, reflected in the sensible, will tarry long at the shrine of Beauty when her every oracle is an infatuation and a cheat. So, therefore, we feel impelled to cling tenaciously to the Platonic idea of an "eternal beauty," a supersensible something shining through the grosser objects of this natural world.

A very simple illustration will make clear what we mean to say. Of a summer morning, on the sward, a drop of dew will flash back successively to the eye of the observer, at the slight-

est shifting of the angle of vision, all the colors of the rainbow, the intensest sapphire, the warmest glow of amethyst, purple, amber, gold, a swift revelation of the utmost witchery of color, all the while winking as from the living eye an overflow of joy, as if to challenge the infinite possibilities of light and shade. But to the mind susceptible of beauty there is no inquiry as to light and shade, and there need be no knowledge of the process by which the sun's rays are refracted in this little globe of dew. Simply it were a dull spirit that would not respond to the joy of this living diamond coquetting there in the grass. By and by, shrunken under the intenser rays of the sun, it loses its hold, and slips down the sides of the plant into the waiting soil, and so, now, has gone to dispense its ministries in the domain of the good.

The drop of dew, like everything else, like the clod, here, that lies ungainly at my feet, is clearly in the realm of the good and the true, and these confessedly are not subject to the sensibilities of men. But is not the joy which the observer found in the witchery of its colors simply the delight of the eye—nothing more than an agreeable titillation of the optic nerve, or at best something that by mental association has become pleasant to the sense? Moreover there is no beauty in the clod, and yet there is in it a perennial fund of interest for the scientist, and it furnishes food for all the harvests of the world. It is a large participant of the good and the true, but there is no æsthetic halo around it, lying there crumbling in the wind.

And so we seem to be widening the breach between these three realms which we have been so eager to identify in their innermost essence and scope. In the drop of dew, for example, what need is there for anything more than three distinct sets of accidental relations and their effects, giving rise to beauty under one set of relations, refraction under another, and finally when the drop has hid itself away in the soil, to the subtle chemistries of use. In the clod the full gamut of possibilities has been cut short before beauty was attained—and so, now, Plato and the idealists are out at sea. But may we not rally in vindication of the clod, and discover in this most unpromising direction the truth of the doctrine we are so anxious to maintain, viz., that

the good, the beautiful, and the true, are everywhere lavish in this world, and that everywhere they substantially coalesce.

In order to do this we must assume the role of philosopher and ascertain what that was which so fascinated us in the iris-hued glances of the drop of dew. It was refraction, no doubt, and all this richness of color lies luxuriantly on the palette of the sun. But these colored rays must enter the eye of an intelligent observer, and somehow be taken hold of by the susceptible spirit, as having something akin to it, over and above the fact of the refraction of light which it may or may not know. Now all attempts at fairly representing beauty must take note in the main of what goes on in the susceptible mind. Is it a pleasure that may be ascribed wholly to the sensibility, determined by the accidents of environment, and coming at last to be delicately cultured and refined?* This question we must meet by some theory of beauty that will give due weight to those deeper processes of thought and feeling which always go on in the mind, in the enjoyment of beauty, whether accounted for or not.

It is exactly at this point that we think the realistic schools are at fault. Being over-anxious to set up everything to a mundane key, and find in physiology a solution for everything under the sun and above it, they have become oblivious to the supreme mystery of thought itself, and have displayed an alarming readiness to let it be replaced by nervous thrills. It is perfectly apparent that nothing of the nature of a direct soul testimony can ever be tortured from the closest anatomy of dead brains, or from pathological observations upon disordered living ones, or from any assumed mental accumulations accruing to the race through

*Mr. Bain has complacently settled this most difficult matter by finding the source of beauty in "a circle of effects." He quietly announces that "the search after some common property applicable to all things named beautiful is now abandoned. Every theorist admits a plurality of causes. The common attribute resides only in the emotion"—in which one knows not which to be astonished at most, the *nonchalant* with which the announcement is made, or the utterly muddled solution with which he proposes to set the problem at rest. There is no "common property" in the things called beautiful, only a "common emotion" in the mind susceptible to the beautiful—and must not the common emotion have a common cause? *See Bain's Mental Science*, p. 292.

successive stages in the evolution of the physiological man. Physiological psychology making the loudest promises to be promptly on hand at an early date with a key to all our profoundest difficulties, is still lagging behind, with a whole army of mustering enthusiasts chanting pæans to progress, and uttering imprecations on the dead past. Not that the three great realms have not been invaded, with a formidable display of vast and imposing forces, and much prowess, and an array of scientific attainment altogether unprecedented in the history of the human mind, and always a free course and the right of way to whatever conquests were fairly within reach. Nor can we say that the panic created, and the commotion stirred up among the old lethargic systems of idealism, by this almost universal movement of the scientific mind of the century against the so-called higher ideas, has left these ideas without a wide and salutary modification in the manner in which they are held.

A renaissance is to come out of it all, in which we shall receive back into our bosoms the old faiths and the old inspirations purged from the dross with which they have been weighted, and refined by these very fires which have threatened to consume them. Religion, philosophy, art, morals, literature—everything must take on an altered aspect from the enforced revisions of the time, and it may not be amiss to concede that readjustments will have to be made quite close to the heart of all the great systems grown venerable with years. But one ineradicable assurance remains. Our transcendental notions, however powerfully assailed, are still asserting themselves with as much insistance as ever, and, what is deeply significant, are nestling at the very core of those elaborate systems which have had in view the specific task of wiping them out. They may be postponed; they cannot be annulled. Proposing an investigation into any natural substance, a clod for example, the mind inevitably starts on a career of inquiry from which it will not divert for any obstacle, until, with either reason or imagination for pilot, it has penetrated to the primordial origin of things.

Here is this clod, for example, which the chemist may analyze to its ultimate elements, and so be able to figure in his mind the invisible gaseous substances out of which the rocky masses, and

watery expanses, and vegetable and animal organisms of our planet are compounded—if his way were thenceforward thoroughly blocked, if there were no conceivable step of induction he could farther take, his mind would push on perforce to the primitive all-substance, to the infinite prime force, which he must conceive of as commensurate with space. He must do this or not be human in his mould; and in doing this, as a matter of universal experience the enigma of the clod is proximately solved. But there is here, let us say, nothing of the beautiful; it is all the true. There is nevertheless great gain for our theory that the mind has been obliged to take a transcendental flight. One flight more for the beautiful, and we shall see that its fountains are even more obviously above the utmost limit of the finite, far down in the very bosom of the Sun of suns.

For this purpose we may recur again to our globule of dew, or what perhaps would better serve our immediate aim, the evening star sinking amid the glories of sunset "on a bed of daffodil sky." Here is a scene to which all souls even the dullest respond. All colors lie athwart the horizon, rose, amber, emerald, blue, and there are those warm, mellow splendors that seem to shoot up from the gates of Paradise fixed somewhere down in that occident world. We watch our "sweet evening star" dropping slowly through the twilight, twinkling, laughing, almost dancing with joy at the prospect of speedily alighting far down by limitless seas of peace and in measureless realms of repose. The fact we note is, that we sail with that star; almost we feel the wings fledging at our shoulders, and the impulse arises in us to be away after it soaring to the same burning goal, and we burst into song—

> "Ye are
> "A beauty, and a mystery, and create
> "In us such love and reverence from afar,
> "That fortune, fame, power, life, have named themselves a star"

—that is, we spontaneously acknowledge, everywhere, all over the world, that somehow that lovely star is a symbol of some of the deepest phases of the universal experience of human life.

Herein its beauty consists, that it finds a point of sympathetic contact with the soul of the observer outside of any physical

order to which as a natural object it must conform. As a matter of fact it will not stay its course down in some measureless realm of peace; it does not dance and sparkle in anticipation of soon getting away from the dust and swelter of a weary world; of the trials and triumphs of human life it knows nothing; it must go on in ceaseless round of dumb revolution forever. But the whole scene, the twinkle of the star down through the glory of the twilight into the purpling splendors of the dying day, conveys a sentiment to the mind of the gazer which is identical in all minds, which all alike feel, even when they cannot define it in words. Now that sentiment is a rational one, and in the mind of the philosopher will certainly get articulated into thought, and behind it all some vast world of beneficence will open out to view. But what we are to seize eagerly at this moment is, that the beauty of the scene comes to us as a joy, primarily, not a thought, not an impulse to any heroic sacrifice, but simply a joy distinctly marked by this, that it does not date from an appetitive source.

When the philosopher comes to look about for the elements of it, and clearly recognizes that he is dealing with an emotion with which the grosser sensibility can have nothing to do, which is profaned by the intrusion of any mere animal desire, and which is compatible only with the most disinterested resting of the soul in the thing for its own sake, he is naturally drawn on to the conclusion that, having so far transcended the sense, he may reasonably hope to find the ultimate source of beauty in a supersensible realm. This, indeed, he will do, if he has not become so enamored of physiological speculations as to count nothing real that does not report its course over a reverberant nerve. The star seems to be human in its kinship; it touches my sense of freedom, sparkling so, and sailing on so serenely down into the soft splendors of another world lying beyond the horizon—a world of ineffable tranquility and light. There may be no such world, but the scene answers to my aspiration, and lends itself as symbol in most apt correspondence to the unsuppressed cravings of every human spirit after an ideal perfection of which this life of ours is but a prolonged hint.

It will be noticed that wherever beauty is, this hint is dis-

tinctly announced. In sky, and air, in distant vistas, in blooming orchards and succulent meadows, in quiet streams running through vast stretches of glimmering landscape, in groves and waterfalls, in the placid lake mirroring the blue heavens in its depths, in "the sleep that is among the hills," in the waving of the fields of grain, in the Summer foliage rolling down the slopes in luxurious overflow of green, in the inimitable blending of colors incarnadine in the flush of health on the maiden's cheek, in the peerless form and carriage of the man, and the play of benignant expression in his face, rendering the human countenance an infinite day-spring of every most varied manifestation of beauty—in all this there is a sense

> "Of something far more deeply interfused,
> Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
> And the round ocean and the living air,
> And the blue sky, and in the mind of man:
> A motion and a spirit, that impels
> All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
> And rolls through all things."

This thing—this "motion and a spirit" that is at the heart of beauty, considered outwardly, is something that kindles into a glow the anticipative yearning of every soul of man after ideal perfection, and persuades him for the moment that he has had a brief foretaste of it let down into the hum-drum of his work-a-day world.

In proof of this we need only recall that it is the supreme prerogative of beauty to solve for the time being every riddle, and set at rest every most inveterate clamor of the soul. Doubts, complaints, rebellions, the chafing of care-worn spirits, all savage instincts, are quieted and subdued in the gentle thralldom of beauty; and the brute passions of men are led upwards by the soft incantations of the eye and ear to the pure shrines of innocence and the white altars of peace. Beauty is the handmaiden of every strong power that walks the earth; and, indeed, her blandishments are sought and subsidized in the baser pursuits of men, and in unseemly places whither she would not spontaneously resort. She is lavish in her favors. There is no hardest utilitarian object that I see now before me on which the

clumsy hand of man has not left some token of her transfiguring presence, an apology and a pledge, as if in the awkward adaptations of the unyielding material, the inventor had solaced himself for his shortcoming by emblazoning her image on the forehead of his work, and promising future grander achievements in her name. The orator, whose main purpose is to sweep along with him the convictions of men, to sway the multitude by some great cause commended to their acceptance by resistless argument and passionate appeal, is always conscious of a subtler power than the naked sword of his logic, namely, the charm of his presence, the light of his eye, the music of his voice, the glow of his individuality arching like a rainbow the torrent of his speech.

And so, also, religion takes on her garments of beauty, because being the King's daughter she is all beautiful within. Religion is the highest form of good possible to men, and, as is inevitable in the order of things, it will come out more and more into lofty systems of spiritual truth which will be but the intellectual rendering of this highest good. But here beauty, preeminently, is in her native home.* Never but once in the history of religious reform was an effort made to sever religion from her æsthetic moorings, and bring her into an unnatural affiance with the ugly and the blank. Temples were made bleak as barns, and the eye and ear, craving the blaze of the new Jerusalem and the far-wafted music of her harps of gold, were made to feed on the staring opacity of speechless surroundings, and the nasal hymnings of congregations knowing only how to drawl. In the infatuation of the time men thought that all beauty was worldly, and that soft melodies and flaming pictures in the house of God were a delusion and a snare. It was held that all personal adornment was a mark of vanity and a great

*Despite the habitual immorality of artists, and the munificence of their free-will offerings in "the worship of the beast," it is nevertheless true that religion and the beautiful are very nearly akin. Conduct alone is the dividing line; and so it is scarcely amiss to say that moral beauty, where all the elements meet in a self-sacrificing life, is, as a concrete attribute of character, religion itself. Matthew Arnold identifies culture and religion by expanding the meaning of culture so as to make it embrace conduct, and so in this light the speculation is not wide of the mark.

sin in those who would walk humbly with the lowly Nazarene. With Him, it was said, there was no beauty that He should be desired, and he walked a woe-stricken wanderer under a lowering sky. Not His beauty, but his goodness, and the ever-during majesty of His thorn-crowned sorrow, had overcome the world, and so in His presence the fetichisms of art and all the carnal blandishments of the sense must be rigidly eschewed. And yet this was He of whom it had been said that He was "the fairest among ten thousand, and the One altogether lovely." In the heat of the extreme reaction against the seductive charms of the Pagan Renaissance coming in to replace with an imposing ceremonial the spiritual simplicity and sweet sincerity of the religion of Jesus, it was thought that all beauty was purely sensual in its habit, and therefore one of the subtlest emissaries of the Evil One in his long warfare against the kingdom of God.

The lesson had not yet been learned—and it is with difficulty embraced even now—that beauty is the bloom and efflorescence of all things; that, as Mr. Ruskin defines it, it "is God's signature upon his works;" the anticipative joy of all things dreaming of the great consummation in far-off stages of ideal perfection; the momentary mood of whatever matter good and true has gained a stadium in the infinite evolution of life.

But we must not talk in rhapsody. Beauty is the synthesis of the good and the true. Where these two are, the good and the true, in answering degrees of evolution, beauty is the commensurate halo in which they are inshrined; and we must insist that all real things in this universe of matter and mind are summed up in the good and the true, and the enveloping *aura* of beauty in which they dwell. The true is not always commensurate with the good, the form with the essence, but where such coincidence exists, and in proportion as it exists, beauty reveals its inevitable charm. Beauty is not truth, and truth beauty, as Keats wanted to say, and as Hegel, also, with his deepest insight into the most elusive moods of the human spirit, was inclined to believe. Nor, on the other hand, was the great Plato exactly right in identifying the beautiful and the good. Nor, finally, was Kant more happy in setting down the beautiful as

something intermediate between the good and the true.* These profound thinkers were severally driven by the logical exigencies of their respective systems to assign a partial and fragmentary place to what in real life has a more manifest sway over the minds of men than anything else.

It ought to have been a strong presumption for them in favor of beauty as something "far more deeply interfused," that it prevails more or less perceptibly everywhere, and that over it there are no wrangling schools. Men turn aside for it from every most engrossing and belligerent interest, as they pause in the ferment and fierce competition of business to say to each other, of a June morning: "The lilacs are in bloom." It is as potential with the savage as with the sage. There is a kind of comprehensive universality about it that gives it a welcome where the good and the true are only reluctantly admitted guests; and while a bad act and a lying tongue may work unmingled mischief among the social relations of men, it is a fact that there is no visible ugliness on the face of the earth that is wholly deformed. So munificently does it pour out from its eternal fountains that the spray of it falls into the interstices of things, and the crevices, and borders of repulsive precincts, where decay and ugliness have pre-empted the space. Now this ought to have suggested a wider sphere for beauty than a mere co-ordinating office or equality of rank with the good and true—a resultant, the rather, of that "universal consecration" in which the good and the true progressively coalesce.

And yet these great philosophers were essentially right in their identifications and intermediations—right as far as they went. The beautiful is one with the good, and one with the

*Kant places the æsthetic judgment between the speculative and practical reason, and so between the good and true. Accordingly he says "the beautiful is that which, through the harmony of its form with the human faculty of knowledge, awakens a disinterested, universal, and necessary satisfaction." This should be taken in connection with his other assertion, that "the beautiful pleases and presents a claim to the assent of all, as a symbol of the morally good, and taste is therefore, at bottom, a faculty which judges of ethical ideas in their sensible manifestation." See condensation of Kant's æsthetic judgment in Ueberweg's History of Philosophy, Vol. 2d, p. 188 *et seq.*

true, and it mediates, also, between the good and the true—because it lies at the heart of the Absolute, and is inherent in every movement of the divine thought as it comes into concrete realization in finite things. It is the divine thought flowering out in all these light-bearing bodies that wheel onward through space, and it gets expression in each particular object in proportion as that object in its particular sphere will give that thought room. But in the divine mind, as in the human mind, thought, as we understand it, is only the infinite depths of the divine love getting configured into form, taking on such definitive shapes as may embody the multitudinous uses of this finite world. Love, thought, beauty—these are the All-Life—one and indivisible—weaving itself out through "the whizzing loom of time" into forms of more and more ample embodiment, on and on, progressively forever, beauty in the meanwhile appearing as this amplification is achieved.

Thus understood Hegel was right. Despite the revulsion with which this ontological view of the universe is wont to be contemplated by the speculative scientists of our day, it is incontestably certain that they have not shown us a better way out. Their theories, powerfully elaborated, all go to pieces exactly at this point. Can any man look out on this interminable expanse of luminiferous worlds, and then downward to the infinitesimal universe of perfect forms and marvelous beauty in a drop of water forsooth, and then inward to what goes on in his thinking mind, without being compelled to assume a universal mind-movement at the centre and circumference of it all? These "new men" that think they have accomplished that fact are at every step of their procedure giving it up. They must. Hegel at least established one thing that is undeniable forever, and that is, that no material object were thinkable at all, or were renderable into terms of human thought, unless that object were somehow or other of the nature of thought. Therefore his great conception of the divine "Idea" evolving itself in an interminable series of self-limiting movements, spirally onward and upward forever, toward higher and higher stages of self-realization —if this cannot be technically received, there is this much indisputably in it, that at the heart of every finite thing infinite

love is dispensing its life in such measures of beneficent use as the obvious laws of its development will describe. Hegel's "Idea" should, perhaps, have been the thinkable formula of the infinite love which is the deepest conception of the divine life that we can entertain. Then as nearly as possible we should have had exactly what we ought to believe.* At all events, if the alternative were, in locating the *natura naturans*, to find it in atoms self-generated and working themselves up into the order and glory of the cosmos through the blind jostle of reciprocal action, or in an infinite impulse of intelligent affection concreting itself in multitudinous forms of joy everywhere in space, who could for a moment hesitate as to his choice?

Nevertheless, to arrive at a satisfactory rationale of beauty we must take one step farther with Hegel. His notion of beauty as consisting of the divine "Idea," or let us say the divine life subjecting itself to manifold self-limitation and self-realization in finite forms, carries with it by implication the notion of the involution of beauty in all these forms, and the successive evolution of it as these forms are pushed on from one stage of perfection to another in the building up of the worlds. If we can free ourselves, for a time, of the hard terms of his dialectic, and ask ourselves what are the obvious facts in this matter, we shall have to concede at once that there is in the universe around us a continual advance of things from the simple to the complex, from a primordial condition of comparatively amorphous and

*It would seem that Hegel in his Philosophy of Religion recognized *love* as at the heart of all being, as the *prius* and very definition of life, but he has not availed himself of this in his Æsthetics. Prof. Kedney in his most admirable recension of Hegel's Æsthetics supplies the hiatus in these very apt words: "No imaginative endeavor, no process of abstraction, can sever feeling from thought. Thought and feeling are not contradictories or aliens, opposite poles, one of which must weaken as the other strengthens; one of which must die when the other becomes perfect. Rather they are essential characteristics of all concrete and possible existence. Feeling is before thought, and thought is for feeling, rather than feeling for thought. When feeling is made the object of thought, it has itself stimulated that thought; indeed it has originated all thought, for, in the development of the human subject, feeling is first, and thought is but its determination from without, and its clarification." See Kedney's Hegel's Æsthetics, Griggs' Philosophical Classics, p 37.

functionless being up through endless gradations of more and more perfectly defined adaptation and use.

The history of our planet which we can read now in legible characters on the rocks, and in the stranded records of the ancient seas, justifies the inference, suitably qualified, that the "promise and potency" of all we now behold was in the primitive nebulous masses or star-dust we see floating in space. Through aeons and aeons this planet of ours, and we assume all planets, were in the process of building, and building, we are compelled to believe, by no hap-hazard adjustment of atoms, but by some imbedded plan, or involution of elements, that determined from the first the steps of the ascending scale. There was evidently a time in the history of this globe when there was no organic life anywhere on its bosom, when the hills were furnaces and the seas steaming baths. There were no fish in the waters, and no blade of grass, nor tree, nor living thing on the fire-swept continents. How ever organic life sprouted in this domain of cinder, or took shape in the oozy depths of tepid seas, we may never know, but the doctrine of evolution has been far enough verified to settle it forever that the divine "Idea," or divine life, working in these cosmic forms, has progressively ascended in a scale of perfection, from cycle to cycle, until it has reached the stage at which we see it now.

Nor have we reason to doubt that the same process of change and modification, always for the better, is going on at this moment, as well in the social life of the peoples as in the organic forces of the vegetable and animal worlds. Each stage happily is recorded, and it is the brilliant achievement of modern science that it has recovered the way-marks of this sublime movement from the bewildering maze of nature's most intricate unfoldings, and so opened a fountain of ever-fresh revelation in the results of comparative research. Why there should be any hesitancy in accepting the logical implication of an ascending scale in being, or in speaking of it as moving on in obedience to an intelligent plan inhering originally in it; why scientists should be so shy of a beneficent, self-conscious, God-revealing process in what they recognize as a scheme of evolution, or *anavolution*—

if I may invent a term—on a stupendous scale, and prefer to think of the world as having made its long stretches of advance under the accidental jolting of shadowy atoms falling into place —this, I say, is puzzling, and even irritating, to one accustomed to have respect to the unsuppressed cravings of the human mind.

It is the natural bent of every thinking creature on earth to regard everything as being not simply a product of power, and so therefore of power directed to an intelligent end, but also as having the same intelligent power in it conserving it thenceforth in a system of things. If that power has been crudely conceived, and so fetichism, and animism, and polytheism, and all forms of anthropomorphism have held long reign over the minds of men, with accompanying superstitions retarding the intellectual development of the race—nevertheless all this is cumulative evidence that the human mind cannot, without special training, rid itself of the notion of a divine energy in creation, not less, but infinitely more, than itself. It is little matter with what name we denote it, the "Idea" with Hegel, or the "Creative Soul of the World" with Lotze, or the divine life, it is there without question, and it is moving the universe upward in accordance with an ideal inherent in itself, and immanent in every minutest atom of the teeming worlds.

Now the conclusion for which all this has been preparing the way, is that progress, or evolution let us say, is but the upward advance of cosmic forces, and of the finite spirit as well, by some rhythmic process by which things lagging behind are helped forward by things already before. As the climber lifts himself to an advanced foot-hold, by clasping some object with an adventurous hand higher up than the position he has attained, so, in like manner, even if there be no adequate explanation of the speculative difficulties in the process, this much-bruited matter, of "unstable equilibrium" is at the basis of all upward movement in terrestrial things. One thing gets the better of another, and so draws that other up. And this only secondarily through a change of environment; primarily, we must believe, through the all-pervading and all-brooding creative soul of the world, that determines every minutest movement among the atoms, and sways the fluent immensities to its behest.

But, then, as we have agreed to sum up the essential properties of everything in the good and the true, and see beauty only in the coalescence of these two, it must follow that in all finite existence, in order that progress be possible, something of a *quasi* separation between these two, and their subsequent resumption into one again, must be assumed, and that thus the lower stages are transcended and the higher ones attained. Good gets in advance of the true, or the true of the good; or, if this be not quite conceivable, it may be allowable to say that as between the organic and inorganic worlds, between the animal and the man, the advance has been effected by new increments of the infinite love taking on more intricate and more adequate forms to correspond. These more ample forms, coming up promptly at the impulse of every new forthgoing of the divine Logos, answer to our notion of the true. If the scale is an ascending one, it is because at each step a new stadium of perfection has been attained, and the very notion of perfection implies the coalescence of the good and the true.

We may find a familiar illustration of this in the conscious experience of every human soul. There springs up, let us not say how, a longing, an aspiration, to be something better than we are—an indeterminate craving to get into a purer, cleaner, sweeter altitude of life. The will is driving on ahead. The affections are stretching out their *antennae* to feel the temperature of the spaces lying beyond; and so with no other light than the faint gloaming of a higher instinct we push on to wondrous transfigurations of character—but not until the understanding has found out the ways and means, or otherwise the laws of spiritual life, in accordance with which those transformations are effected. Not the impulse alone, however lofty and pure that may be, but the impulse directed and fashioned by the strong light of an understanding illuminated from above—this lifts the man up; and the beauty of his moral being will be apparent when his head and heart agree, when his noble promptings and his enlightened understanding harmoniously blend. There is no moral beauty in the unstable fanatic on the one hand, nor the flint-eyed theologian on the other—the one all heart, and the other all brain. It is when knowledge and zeal set up as con-

jugal partners in the conquered virtues of a well-ordered life, that this tabernacle of the spirit rays out, through all its courts and curtains, the ineffable splendors of the Shekinah within.

Unquestionably here it is the good getting in the lead of the true, and the true coming up promptly with its formulas to correspond. When these two are commensurate light breaks from the cloud, and we have the most beautiful picture that is anywhere visible on this earth, or will be visible in yonder skies—the picture of a perfect, matchless man.

Our thought immediately goes back to Him, the incomparable One, who sprang up in the historic centuries the very image of the eternal calm, and who transplanted, as we believe, the human archetype from its home in the bosom of God to the limitations and hard disciplinary environment of this natural world—the one sole perfect one, amid populations groping for the better through nights of ignorance and tempests drifting with blood. We find his peerless moral perfection and beauty described, as nearly as possible, in the exact terms we have used —He was "full of *grace and truth.*" "We beheld his glory," that is, his supernal beauty, "the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." In Him the good and the true in infinite measures flowed together and were mutually interfused in flawless accord, so that he could consistently announce himself the incarnate love of God, and at the same time the way and the truth and the life. He was love and truth in perfect human embodiment, wrought out, however, and configured progressively, through a life of sublime self-sacrifice, to the ideal type of manhood, as this must dwell forever in the mind of God.

It has occurred to us that the secret of this divine biography lies in a feature of it upon which he often enough, and with visible tenderness and detention, dwelt, but over which the impatient eye of the ordinary reader is wont to run in vain. This man, a pilgrim like the rest, eating, drinking, sleeping like the rest, at war with the recalcitrant environment of this world, as every good man is, in the effort to lift himself up to the full measure of his spiritual possibilities—this Son of Man speaks constantly of his "glorification," meaning by it, evidently, some

process of personal inner transfiguration going on in the very tissues of his experience, as He travailed with the buffetings of wicked men and the combined onset of the powers of darkness rushing to his defeat. He speaks of it, always, as something coming to a progressive consummation, and fully realized only when the stern stubborn contradictions of His estate in the flesh had been vanquished, and the flesh itself metamorphosed into spirit by the consuming splendors of the beatific spirit within. His glorification was His *beautification;* and if we want to have an impressive vision of it we can catch a momentary epiphany of it on Mt. Tabor, when He was caught up in mid-air, and His face shown as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light; or its permanent habit can be seen, as it is now beheld by the angels, by looking beyond the sepulchre into the perennial glories of the resurrection morn.

What we urge is that this picture of transcendent moral beauty came out in a way exactly analogous to that in which beauty anywhere developes itself, appearing always on the accord of the good and the true, and in proportion as, in commensurate measures, these two mount upward in an ascending scale.

Wherever beauty is, in the physical, intellectual, and moral worlds, substantially the same law prevails. When assuming the critical attitude in examining the human face, for example, we inquire as eagerly after the true as of anything else, and by the presence or absence of this determine whether our nobler emotions have been honestly or fraudulently addressed. In art the same process goes on, only that the genius of the artist sets itself to the task of anticipating the full blown ideal of which he gets glimpses and fragmentary hints in the natural world around him, and is able proximately to embody it in poem, or picture, or statue, in proportion as he has the capacity in his inventions of welding the good and the true into an indissoluble compound. Everywhere it is the good and the true—beauty distilling gently from the union of the two.

Hence the obvious folly of the old controversy about the relative superiority of art over nature or of nature over art. There is manifestly no comparison to be made. The combinations of the living artist, assuming now that his intuitions of the beauti-

ful are delicate and profound, may in a given instance surpass any like exhibition in the natural world, even on the assumption that these natural forms are the æsthetic evolution of the divine mind, because, first, the works of the infinite artist are confessedly *in transitu*—the picture is sketched only in outline—and then, secondly, the sub-artist is of the nature of spirit, and carries the divine "Idea" within him in a stage of development to which it has not attained in the natural world. But the process is the same in both, and in a work of art, as every one sees, it is altogether a question as to how high in inspiration the genius of the artist has been lifted, and to what extent his technique has served him in getting the eternal truth of things embodied in his work.

A far more pressing matter in this connection is the problem of the sublime. What is the sublime? Instinctively we feel that it is in some way related to beauty; and, indeed, in loose language we familiarly speak of it as beauty in the large, as beauty with the added element of infinity, or vastness, or obscurity, or some quality inspiring awe or terror even, but not so far removed as to be in a category by itself. Sublime! Beautiful! we say, sometimes not closely discriminating as to relative province of these terms, and feeling always that the one may insensibly glide into the other.

The tourist standing on Goat Island and looking down upon the plunge of Niagara, on a clear October morning with the sun at proper focus, will witness the rarest juxtaposition of these elements anywhere to be seen in this world. There is a sea of waters roaring over a mountain ledge, and boiling and leaping in maddened conflict in the abyss below, the thunder of its echo suggesting the crash of dissolving worlds, and the voice of the Almighty shouting from its uttermost caverns. Anon the blue rim of the overarching torrent is lashed into spray, and this rolls up a vast luminous cloud of mist, until it lies like a curtain round the tabernacle of the sun. But what startles most is the apparition of a perfect rainbow, not spanning the abyss, but wheeling like the revolving cherubim of Ezekiel on the very bosom of the waters, and touching at its zenith the blue arch of the sky.

A burst of commingling emotions breaks from the lips of the beholder, and it little boots him what technical term will best embody the ebullition of his joy. But coming to philosophize about it, we see that commotion, the ferment of some sort of struggle, is the ruling condition of that portion of the spectacle which we would call sublime, while, as in the case of the rainbow, beauty should come to us with the image of eternal calm pictured upon her brow. That rainbow sweeps in serene circuit over a pavilion of mist, quiet, peaceful, definite in outline and with a perfection of color forever inimitable by the hand of art, hinting the sublime only where its burnished periphery mounts into the sky. It engirdles the ruins of a falling ocean as a bow of promise, anticipating the coming calm, when these warring billows shall break through their confinement, and flow on in an unimpeded current to the sea.

Beauty, then, we infer, is the goal of the sublime; or, rather, the sublime wherever witnessed involves a preliminary struggle in the march of the elements toward that state of equilibrium over which, at least in idea, beauty is the unchallenged queen.

In the natural world we are familiar with this elemental strife, in the storms that rend the heavens and tear up the seas from their lowest depths; in the hurricane that gathers up cities and forests in its track, and hurls all the power and glory of man into shapeless ruin and death; in earthquakes; in seasons of pestilence when the fell destroyer stalks unseen over the panic stricken populations at noon-tide and night, and the uninvaded marshall all their wisdom and skill to keep its baleful shadow from their homes. There is no beauty here; and yet to one sufficiently far off not to be caught in the whirl, there is a kind of satisfaction aroused by the spectacle that he instinctively designates the sublime. He must forget the human suffering entailed, and look out upon it simply as a mighty movement struggling in the air, as one would view from a lofty eminence the onset of contending armies on some decisive battle-field, advancing, recoiling, batteries belching, banners waving, the very air hurtling with the demoniac whiz of exploding shell, the gleam of bayonets, the rush of horsemen, the blare of the trumpet, the roll of the drum, the cry of the wounded, and over

all a cloud of smoke and darkness settling to hide the carnage from the sun—a bloody sight indeed, and in all respects, save one, revolting to the sensitive soul. It is a sublime sight, because some moral beauty lies beyond toward which this bloody tempest will sweep onward with all the new-made issues of the decisive day.

Now it may sound pedantic to speak of a struggle between the good and the true in the maelstrom of Niagara. But every physicist in resolving the elemental war which he sees in nature will speak of the temporary loss of balance in the ordinary quiet ongoing of her forces, and justify the commotion as that whereby the equilibrium is restored. What is this after all but saying that in the processes of nature, at the point of their disturbance, there is a want of harmony between the end toward which they are moving and the means by which that end is attained. The means are recalcitrant to the end. But the end is always the *conatus* of the great loving spontaneity at the heart of all things, and could not be anything else but good, in the long run, in any order where progress is the law. If good exists at all it must constitute the essential being of the whole universe of matter, and supply the *primum mobile* for every possible movement among the atoms in space. This deific impulse, pushing among the tardy forces of a world heavily freighted with inertia, must win its way to its beneficent goal of fashioning its own instruments and conquering its own means; and it is impossible to conceive of this except on the hypothesis of "contradictions" or the apathetic resistance of the gross material to the *eisemplastic* thought of God.

In the moral world we can have no question of the possibility of such resistance. We see it every day. Men throw themselves into the current of the divine impulses or against them, and a struggle ensues. Immediately every one consents to consider that struggle as the outcome of the conflicting fortunes of the good and the true. All poetry and all fiction have their legitimate province here. Heroism, the awful grandeur of a titanic will throwing itself against infinite odds to conquer or perish in the attempt; the storm of passion; the meeting of mighty currents of causality with a strong-minded man or a

beautiful woman in the vortex; self-sacrifice with all the agony and darkness of the momentary eclipse of the good, the flushed malignities crying, "Put out the light, and then—put out the light;" the crucifixion on a lurid background of judgment, and the pouring out of vials upon weltering cities of Sodom and of Egypt; the furies with glaring eye-balls and disheveled hair pursuing their victim, and lashing with a whip of scorpions the flying culprit until he drops down helpless before the altars of religion, and is 'ware of the bursting splendors of a divine face "lifted up and reconciled;" the secret of history, the mysteries of the cross—all that involves or suggests the militant aspect of good and truth in the world, is the legitimate subject of art, and is æsthetic because these moral conflicts have the serene star of destiny over them, and will inevitably settle into the atonements of beauty, by and by, when what Gœthe calls the "universal consecration" has come about.

Everywhere and always there is a struggle in the sublime, as between the infinite and the finite when one looks up in the starry sky, and waits until his imagination has somewhat fathomed its illimitable deeps, or out upon the ocean with its far-stretching bosom palpitating to the moon. Or otherwise it is a struggle between light and darkness, tempest and sunshine, physical and moral force, good and bad, the all-conquering good dragging the slow-moving formulas of truth and the debris of dissolving institutions in its powerful wake. When the storm goes by then beauty settles over all the land; quiet reigns; the fields are green; the cattle graze upon the hills; and the trees stand together in peaceful community in the woods. Fresh breezes are abroad. The skies are washed clean. Men were awed by the storm; but now when its toppling thunder crags have fallen to pieces and drifted with the wind, they overflow with joy, for a new day has dropped down from the pavilion of the sun, beauty has again stretched out her potent wand, and a reassured confidence prevails that everything in the end is good and true.

At this point we must arrest our discussion having but barely lifted the veil from immense vistas of suggestion into which the

fascinating topic opens out. We have feared that the realism of our day in art, literature, science and religion, though without doubt predestined to contribute in some salutary way to the ultimate uplifting and advance of all the interests involved, is in danger of slipping from the eternal foundation of things, and so carrying all high spiritual verities down with it into the mire.

Every now and then, in the history of mind, the sorcery of the senses discovers new devices and conjures up new seductions whereby for the moment the higher nature of man is beguiled. The movement then is retrograde until the stronger intellectual and moral forces come to the rescue, and the infatuation is checked. Wide-spread hallucinations do sometimes become intrenched in the heart of an age, and run their long and enervating course like a disease preying on the human frame. Fanaticisms rage. Reason and common sense go into duress. The nobler instincts, taken by surprise, are for the moment thrown back into paralysis and defeat, by the whole world seeming to swarm in the trail of some newly-risen wil-o'-the-wisp.

It looks very much as if such a period of blight were on us now. We do well to set our hearts in unwavering fealty to certain moral behests, which in all times of confusion and questioning provide a kind of inner illumination to determine what ultimately is the right way. There is in us always, unless where there is an anomalous condition of complete spiritual inversion, what Lotze calls an "appreciative feeling," that is, a *feeling for values* in the moral world around us, when the light of the intellect fails as yet to put such values in definite relief. So long as there is obviously conscious mind in the universe in which we move, and it has a qualified supremacy over that which is other than itself, so long will men continue to believe that the grosser forces, condensed into rock-ribbed and metal-bound planets, are pervaded and swayed by an all-plastic free mind, best conceived of as the "centre everywhere" of the good, the beautiful and the true.

Our *feeling for values* amounts almost to a moral imperative in this case. We may be certain that science after far-off and persistent voyaging on alien seas, will at last hitherward trim her weather-worn sails, for it is only under the decoy of ingen-

ious speculations that she has dared to set at nought these irrepressible appreciative instincts of the human soul. Facts indeed we must have, but principles as well. What we deprecate is, that in an age when fact is deified the one great fact of mind should be systematically ignored,—mind in the investigator, and mind in the object about which his research is at work. Such "mindless" theorizing cannot long retain its usurped supremacy in the philosophic domain.

Even now we begin to see that the outcry against the bugbear of speculation in the name of science, and because of the inviolability of fact, was raised in the camp of speculation itself, and that the satire is coming back upon the satirists with a terrible rebound. Men may speculate as wildly about atoms, and forces, and the genesis of life, and the laws of evolution, and the ultimate constitution of things, from the laboratory as from the seclusion of the Sibylline cave, from the widest knowledge of beast and bird life as from the profoundest questionings of the subtlest movements of the human mind. That taunt has lost its edge. As long as mind is with us we shall insist on its paramount importance in the scale of values, and not hesitate to award it an absorbing place in all the material quantities around us—mind always, and the God of mind.

ARTICLE II.

BOSSUET.

By Rev. H. H. Hall, A. M., Millersburg, Ohio.

A study of a great genius is not only a most pleasing occupation, but it is exceedingly helpful. The man who has a magnificent physique takes the eye at once. Nothing in the world is more agreeable to behold than a perfect human form. When the excellence consists in the intellect, or soul, the admiration of mankind is still more profound. But if it is a genius we are contemplating our feeling rises into one of awe and even of worship. Nothing is higher; nothing is rarer. Genius cannot be grown; it cannot be acquired. No power on the earth can confer it. It is said the emperor Maximilian, that grand old

patron of the fine arts, declared he could make as many noblemen as he wished out of his peasants but he could not change his noblemen into artists. Genius is the direct gift of our Creator, and it is his highest gift. It is no wonder that it has always had such power among men. All doors are ever open to it; it goes whithersoever it pleases and has everywhere its almost irresistible will. It is the purpose in this paper to consider a genius as remarkable and gifted as any in his calling—"the eagle of Meaux."

Jacques Benigne Bossuet was born in Dijon, Sept. 27, 1627. He was at first intended for the bar. But on account of his clerical appearance, for which he was distinguished even in his boyhood, and his unusual talents which pointed him out as peculiarly adapted to the pulpit, he was soon destined for the Church. Lamartine has this fine passage upon his youth: "There is no trace of a fault to be seen in his childhood, or of an act of levity in his youth; he seemed to escape the frailties of nature without a struggle, and to have no other passion than love for the beautiful and the good. One would have said that he himself respected in advance the future authority of his name, of his ministry, and that he was anxious that there should not be a human spot to wipe away from the man of God when he should leave the world to enter upon the duties of the tabernacle." Thus having a most admirable character, of good ancestry, brought up in the society of books and wonderfully endowed with personal qualities, it is not surprising that young Bossuet was in great favor and the recipient of very respectful attention everywhere. At the institutions he attended "he was a prodigy and a school angel," exhibiting great aptness for learning and much ability in his public performances. He was admitted to several of the salons which flourished in his time and at sixteen years of age, by invitation, preached his first sermon in that of Madame de Rambouillet, where the greatest literary and other notables gathered for purposes of literary pastime and improvement. And although he was universally admired and caressed as few youths have ever been, he did not become in the least proud or filled with self-love.

His advancement to place was very rapid. At eight he was

tonsured, and was hardly thirteen years old when he was made a canon of the cathedral at Metz. Here he remained about six years, employing his time in incessant writing and study. His sermons produced a deep impression, and are highly praised for their youthful fire and imagination as well as erudition. He also began here his controversies with the Protestants, many of whom resided in that province. Occasionally he went to Paris to preach and was, therefore, already known in the metropolis of France as an orator of splendid powers. He soon received the title of Bishop of Condom, and about the same time was made preceptor to the dauphin. In 1681 he became bishop of Meaux.

He was large of frame, in bearing noble and even proud, but not arrogant. His hair was of a brown tint, his forehead high and full and his eyes black. His "look was pleasant and piercing," and "his voice appeared always to proceed from a passionate soul." There was in his whole physiognomy great delicacy, "the mouth singularly agreeable in expression, delicate, speaking even when it is in repose," a rare intelligence and great goodness. "Nature," says Bausset, "endowed him with the noblest of figures."

Residing at Meaux and among his priests, the work he did in his diocese was prodigious. He spent much time visiting the sick and in doing acts of charity and piety. He was frequently called to court and, because of his extraordinary tact as a man and integrity as a priest, the king consulted him in his most delicate affairs.

Bossuet was a great admirer of Homer and Virgil, both of which he knew by heart. The book, however, which more than any other wrought itself into his very being, was the Bible. That was his rule in all things, the source of his whole life and faith. When he first read it "he was completely illuminated and transported." This same devotion to Holy Writ he held to the end of his life, and even during his illness at Meaux made it, all the while, the subject of his profoundest study. It has been said that he also knew the Bible by heart.

One can easily see in all his writings and preaching how he was possessed with the old Hebrew economy, and held to the

notion of the continued government of Providence, both in church and state. Consequently he spoke with something of the authority and power of the prophet and leader of Israel, Moses. This was the reason of his belief in divine right. Upon this ground did he maintain that the king might by the enactment of laws, secure the submission of all heretics to the religion and practices of Catholicism. It was this doctrine that was the basis of all his controversies and opposition to those who were of a contrary faith. And, yet, the great mind of Bossuet was able to catch much of the spirit of the New Testament. He was inclined to tolerance and charity. "I am of all saints' order, and all saints are of my order," said he. Guizot declares that he even came near seeing the truth of that celebrated saying of Bernard: "When God shall give us grace to enter Paradise, we shall be above all astonished at not finding some of those whom we had thought to meet there and at finding others whom we did not expect."

It becomes apparent, then, how that his character and teaching would seem in some respects contradictory, and he would be the subject of much severe criticism. Protestants blamed him for his writings against them. They even charged him with encouraging the King to revoke the Edict of Nantes. Because of his connection with the Gallican Church, and, especially, on account of the adoption through his influence and efforts, of the four articles in which the liberties and doctrines of that Church were set forth, he was condemned by the pope and his writings upon that subject pronounced heretical. His views upon government were used to strengthen absolute monarchy. He had said: "To submit to the public orders is to submit to the orders of God, who establishes empires." Napoleon Bonaparte used that saying to bolster his authority over the people of France. He exclaimed on one occation: "My religion is that of Bossuet; he is my Father of the Church," and clapping his hand upon the hilt of his sword, he declared his intention to enforce the sentiments of that bishop. Indeed, a catechism, entitled "Bossuet's Catechism" was introduced by a decree of Bonaparte, in which the duties of the subjects to their emperor were set forth in a most remarkable manner.

And, yet again, he spoke grandly for tolerance and freedom. All this, however, is the result of the times in which Bossuet lived. A man who avoids the extremes of thought and action, especially in a period of great agitation and unrest, will, of course, be called weak and inconsistent. Viewed from this distance the life of this man is harmonious. There is no contradiction, but honesty of opinion and purpose, and genuine beauty and great strength.

The failure of Bossuet as instructor to the dauphin affords a striking instance of the truth so often demonstrated, that transcendent genius is not to be confined to certain routine, or a sphere not distinctly its own. It is like putting an eagle into a cage, or harness upon Pegasus. It was the same thing which Garfield lamented in the beginning of his administration, when he said: "I have been dealing all these years with ideas, and here I am dealing only with persons. I have been heretofore treating of the fundamental principles of government, and here I am considering all day whether A or B shall be appointed to this or that office." It was because of his intolerance of detail that Shelley's longer works have not the finish which we find in his shorter ones, and which his friends heartily wish he had given them. Washington Irving promptly declined the editorship which Sir Walter Scott offered him, whereby he might be relieved in his emergency, because he felt himself unfitted for *regular service.* And Charles Lamb chafed exceedingly, while working in the India House, because he could not scribble his own free thoughts in verse or prose, but was obliged to "write of tea and drugs, and piece goods and bales of indigo." Bossuet, however, discharged his duties with fidelity, irksome as they must have been to him; studied the classic authors, gave exercises in grammar and wrote treatises, all for the little prince. The labor was in vain, because "the very loftiness, the extent and profundity of his views rendered Bossuet unfit to get at the heart and mind of a boy who was timid, idle and kept in fear by the king as well as by his governor."

Like Fenelon, Bossuet was a Cartesian, and always appealed to reason and the free exercises of the mind. Descartes died in 1650, when Bossuet was twenty-two years old. But the philos-

opher had created an epoch in mental science, and for some time after his death, all thinking people in England and France thought in his manner. Even the mystics, of whom Pascal was a representative, agreed with him in many things. In his Treatise on the Knowledge of God and of Self, which he wrote for the dauphin, Bossuet applied religious principles to philosophy, according to the system of Descartes. He was also in the better sense a mystic. He did not go to the extent that others did in the doctrine of *pure love.* The main point in the dispute between him and Fenelon was, whether love of God must be entirely disinterested—whether "the soul must be raised above all regard to its own holiness and happiness.

As a writer, Bossuet was a master of prose, and shared with Descartes and Pascal the honor of perfecting the French language. His Exposition of the Faith he wrote for Turenne, and the conversion of that noble and heroic general to Catholicism, as well as that of some others, was doubtless due to this book. In his controversies he was artful and characterized by great dexterity and consummate prudence. The most celebrated of his controversial works he based upon the differences among Protestant doctors and the changes which their doctrines and discipline had undergone. His aim was to prove, upon the ground of their disagreement with each other and the instability of some tenets of their faith, the falseness of the religion of the reformers. The fate of this book alone was sufficient to refute such a theory. It was disapproved by the pope. It was condemned by the University of Louvain. The Sorbonne rejected it at first, but the fathers of that theological seminary afterward changed their opinion and accepted it. Indeed the variance of view in this matter was surprising, and showed that there was no more harmony or agreement among the Catholics, than among those whom they so stenuously opposed. There are many other works of which Bossuet was author.

It is said that Bossuet was always master of himself—preserved his natural serenity of mind and manner—save in the controversy with Fenelon, in the matter of Madame Guyon. In that affair even his best friends and admirers pronounce him unjust and furious. There is no doubt, but that he was affected

by the common passion, ambition, and looked with envy upon a man who was rapidly rising in fame and had great talents. He influenced both the king and pope and used every art to secure the humiliation of his rival, and succeeded. Fenelon was exiled in his diocese of Cambray and the book he wrote in defense of the noted female Quietist was condemned.

His faithfulness and zeal, however, for what he believed to be right never flagged. That he came short of apprehending the very highest privilege of man, the freedom of conscience, and was influenced by passion, is only because he was human. Even artifice it is so natural to employ in the heat of controversy, in spite of one's desire to be perfectly fair and honest. The great wonder is, that at such a court and under the patronage of such a king, there were clergymen of such integrity and purity. Bossuet did what he could to reform the manners of his times. The passionate, haughty Madame de Montespan was in high favor with the king—indeed she was his mistress. She flaunted in the presence of the queen and was the cause of much scandal. Bossuet determined to remove and end the foul disgrace. He wrote to Louis these plain words: "Pluck this sin from your heart, sir, and not only this sin, but the cause of it; go even to the root. In your triumphant march amongst people whom you constrain to recognize your might, would you consider yourself secure if a rebel fortress of your enemy still had influence there? We hear of nothing but the magnificence of your troops, of what they are capable under your leadership! And as for me, sir, I think in my secret heart of a war far more important, of a far more difficult victory which God holds out before you. What would it avail you to be dreaded and victorious without, when you are vanquished and captive within?" Thus he sought earnestly, to reclaim the monarch from his evil practices and vices, forgetting self entirely in his desire to further the honor and glory of God.

He died at Paris, April 12, 1704. The friends who were with him in his last hours were inclined to pronounce praises upon his episcopal life. But having always chosen realities in preference to appearances he remained true to his nature, rejected

their eulogies with scorn and said: "Speak to me of necessary truths."

It yet remains to consider this wonderful man as a preacher and orator. It is a truth which any observer will readily allow, that every man must hew out his path to success in his own way. So it is in life; so it is in every calling. One need not ask another how he succeeded with the expectation of following exactly the same course and achieving exactly the same result. Each individual differs from every other in the matter of circumstances, as well as of genius, and for that reason he must travel independently of the route somebody else has taken. Two men will never rise up from humble station to one of great prominence in the business world in precisely the same way. One poet or artist cannot expect to employ the methods of another poet or artist. Of course, there are some general maxims which may be borne in mind and followed, but every man's personality is distinctly seen in what he has done grandly—he has been himself. Saul may wear his heavy armor—it becomes him and he is not encumbered by it—but David must fight with his sling and smooth stones gathered from the brook.

This is all equally true in oratory. A careful study of the masters of eloquence reveals the fact that each had some especial secret of power. Cicero could not have been a Demosthenes and Demosthenes could not have been a Cicero. The Roman did not pronounce his orations in the perfect form in which they have been handed down to us, but he gave great attention to every detail of delivery. He had a voice like a god and he could modulate it perfectly. This with his other graces of speech made him the optimus orator. The Greek had great power in delivery, but his orations were finished beforehand. It was for this reason that his enemies declared they smelled of the oil. Cicero thought of himself and his audience. And he could not well help it, for every one of his hearers knew, and would tell him, too, if he did not make the proper angle of the elbow, or drop the toga as he ought to have done, or missed the exact cadence of voice. Demosthenese also addressed a cultured audience, but he thought only of his cause. Hence he despised ornament. The great English orator, Pitt, could not

succeed with much preparation beforehand—his set speeches were all failures. Macaulay tells us that a critic who had often heard him remarks: "No man ever knew so little what he was going to say;" and himself adds, "Indeed his facility amounted to a vice. He was not the master but the slave of his own speech. So little self-command had he when he once felt the impulse, that he did not like to take part in a debate when his mind was full of an important secret of state. 'I must sit still,' he once said to Lord Shelbourne, on such an occasion; 'for when once I am up, everything that is in my mind comes out.'" Some one has said that Charles Fox "throws himself into the middle of his sentences, and leaves it to God Almighty to get him out again." It was upon this last plan that a famous preacher in Boston got hopelessly entangled, and was only able to extricate himself by saying: "Brethren I don't know exactly where I went in, in beginning this sentence; and I don't in the least know where I'm coming out; but one thing I *do* know, I'M BOUND FOR THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN."

Bossuet differed from all these as to his methods and power. His natural qualifications were a fine appearance, an extraordinary memory, complete mastery of the language, and in addition to all, great personal magnetism. He wrote his sermons only in fragments. When he repeated them, he diverged in wording and development as he was moved by the occasion. In concluding one of his discourses he claims to have preached it "as the Lord inspired me." And yet there is every reason to believe that he labored much in the way of general preparation. His incessant use of the pen had considerable to do in perfecting his style as an extemporaneous preacher. It is evident, also, that some of his finest passages had been prepared and held in reserve for occasion. These are found repeated in various addresses and sermons. And when he arose to speak to the people he was the man of the hour. He found no difficulty in expanding his subject. There was no doubt troubling him, and hence he easily proved his points. He was all aglow and imbued with the truth he was uttering—his thought expressed itself in his look. The pulpit was his throne, and he occupied it like one in his own rightful domain, having received authority

from God. And his eloquent voice, his sublime pathos, and the resistless flow of his utterance which carried with it rich treasures of wisdom, overwhelmed those who heard him. I have somewhere seen it stated that such was his power of utterance that he could pronounce words simply, without any meaning attached to them, and melt his hearers to tears.

It is interesting to follow him in the perfecting of his style, and as he lays off early extravagances and imperfections and gradually adopts a better and maturer expression. At Metz he had the language of the provinces, and his discourses were full of youthfulness. When he went to Paris he discarded many words from his vocabulary and adopted others which were graver and more correct. Every preacher has felt, at some time or other, the influence of a certain auditor upon his manner, and even while composing his sermons has found the question arising whether such a form of expression would meet with the approval of the person according to whose judgment he is unconsciously shaping himself. Such was the case with Bossuet. It is allowed that Louis XIV. did much in this way toward the improvement of this great preacher. "For there was in Louis XIV.," says Sainte-Beuve, "and in the atmosphere about him, something which enforced the cultivation of these qualities and virtues (gravity, proportion, propriety and perfect accuracy,) by all who came within the sphere of the great reign, and in this sense he may be said to have conferred them upon them." He always retained his wonderful imagination and fervor. A good illustration of these qualities is a discourse in which he portrays both the love and anger of Christ, on the occasion of his weeping over Jerusalem. After a fine beginning he announces his theme: "Hear, first of all, the sweet and benignant voice of the Lamb without spot, and afterward you shall hear the terrible roaring of that victorious Lion born of the tribe of Judah: that is the subject of this discourse." In his account of Christ assuming human form—"in order to be compassionate"—he describes him running like a giant, over mountains and hills, from heaven to earth, after the human nature, which tries to evade him, until he has at last overtaken it. He speaks of the compassion of our Lord as it exercised itself in kind and loving

acts. The fact that Pliny had glorified Trajan for traveling over the world more by his victories than by his footsteps he mentions, and then utters these felicitous words: *"And what does this mean, think you,—to travel over provinces by victories? Is it not to carry carnage and pillage everywhere? Ah! in how much more lovely a way did my Saviour travel over Judea! He traveled over it less by his steps than by his kindnesses. He went about in all directions, healing the sick, consoling the wretched, instructing the ignorant. It was not simply the places at which he tarried that found themselves the better for his presence: as many as were his steps, so many were the traces of his bounty. He made the places through he passed remarkable by the profusion of his blessings. In that little village there are no blind men or cripples; no doubt, said one, the kind-hearted Jesus has gone that way." In the second division he is equally powerful and vivid, in the portrayal of the frightful and terrible.

In the same sermon are also seen the great intimacy and warmth of Bossuet's manner, as well as another characteristic, which may be called appropriation. Speaking of the tenderness of Christ he says: "He has pitied us, *that good brother*." He everywhere speaks of things as his own, *my* gospel, *my* Saviour, *my* Father, and so on. And rushing on with marvelous impetuosity and almost unparalleled daring, using the most splendid imagery, now startling his hearers with his abruptness, then charming them with some philosophy of life or exquisite piece of human morality, and couching all in the most beautiful language, it is no wonder that the people were powerfully wrought upon and moved as by some heavenly messenger.

Bossuet could be dull. There are sermons of his which may be read without profit. And yet even in these now and then a passage of striking beauty and suggestiveness meets the eye. Nor could he be great upon every subject. Some men can bring something entirely foreign to a small subject, and thus impart to it an interest and importance which are really not its own. Bossuet could not do that. But it cannot be said of him that he ever fell below, or was unequal to an occasion. The

*I have here availed myself of the translation of William Mathews, LL. D., in his Monday Chats.

greater and grander the theme the greater and grander was Bossuet. This is evident in his eulogies and funeral orations. His sermons upon the death of Henrietta Maria, the great Conde, Anne of Austria, and lastly, the queen of England, prove to what heights of majesty and power he could rise. He was most at home when mighty empires were rocking and dissolving, and when the highest human grandeur gave signs of instability and mortality.

We find in the sermons of Bossuet a frequent use of the most difficult of oratorical figures—apostrophe. In one he addresses Jerusalem, as she is encompassed with "ramparts and forts." When he refutes a heresy, or any erroneous teaching of philosophy, he names the author, as "O Marcion," or "O Montaigne," and speaking to him face to face, pursues him to the very wall. He closes his funeral oration on the prince of Conde with these words: "Accept, O prince! these last efforts of a voice which you once well knew. With you, all my funeral discourses are now to end. Instead of deploring the death of others, henceforth it shall be my study to learn from you how my own may be blessed. Happy if warned by those gray hairs, of the account which I must soon give of my ministry. I reserve, solely, for that flock whom I ought to feed with the word of life, the feeble remains of a voice which now trembles, and of an ardor which is now on the point of being extinct."

Bossuet's daring has been mentioned. There is no reference to self-consciousness or pride. His daring consisted in the truth which he declared and the unfaltering manner in which he declared it. Humility has long ago been commended as a requisite of grand oratory. There is something in a speaker's presumption and audacity which predisposes an auditor against him. If, however, he shows no thought of himself and is modest, then every talent he has tells only the more powerfully in his favor. It is said that the general appearance and manner of Henry Clay were those of "a plain farmer or planter of the back country," that in the opening of his speech he seemed so disqualified and humble as to throw his hearers entirely off their guard and induce them to listen to him with the same easy openness with which they would converse with a neighbor. But, by

and by, when it was little expected, he would take a flight so high and blaze with a splendor so heavenly as filled them with a kind of religious awe and gave him the force and authority of a prophet." There was no insolent boldness in Bossuet's manner, but he was intrepid and even adventurous in the declaration of doctrine and truth. And when the daring of an orator is of that kind, the people feel that it is the mighty genius of the man finding vent and they are spelled with its amazing strength and charm.

There is one more thought with which this paper will close. The highest oratorical genius like that of any other art often fails of being understood and wholly appreciated. The man who has no music in his soul will not be stirred by the most divine symphony or overture. There are many people in the world who would not value the productions of Raphael or Angelo. They are not artists themselves. It requires some "precious seeing to the eye" to place a just estimate upon the highest poetry. It is the same in the moral world. In reference to character there can be no real apprehension, except upon the principle that like alone sees like. "The pure in heart shall see God." It is no wonder then that Bossuet who had the very rarest and most exquisite gift in the sphere of eloquence was not always and universally admired. The people were not orators and therefore they could not be good judges of the best oratory. This is why Bossuet had to share with Bourdaloue the admiration of his age. There was something about the argumentative style of the latter which the masses could understand and appreciate. But, as Sainte-Beuve says: "Bossuet in his highest sphere as bishop, remained the oracle, the Doctor, a modern Father of the Church, the great orator, who appeared on funeral and majestic occasions: who sometimes reappeared in the pulpit at the monarch's request, or to solemnize the Assemblies of the Clergy, leaving on each occasion an overpowering and ineffaceable recollection of his eloquence."

ARTICLE III.

NEHEMIAH.

By Rev. Amasa B. McMackin, A. M., Newberry, S. C.,

A HISTORICAL RESUME.

With the death of Solomon began the decline of the Jewish theocracy. As revealed through Moses, and repeatedly emphasized by those who followed him, the condition upon which Israel was to enjoy to the utmost the favors of God in all of the relations of life, was faithful, invariable conformance to the will of the Lord, as it was contained for their comfort and guidance, in the Scriptures as they were possessed by the priesthood. By Solomon himself seeds were sown the harvest of which was to be apostacy and crime. Spared by the mercy of God from witnessing the dissolution of his kingdom, the accession of his son Rehoboam was but the signal for the consequent separation of the ten tribes and the formation of a rival kingdom. Now begins the great apostacy, as the two nations seem to vie with each other in their gross and shameless departure from righteousness and truth. The reign of evil increases and extends its influence with the progress of time, and if here and there along the downward path in which the two kingdoms were rushing were to be seen gleams of better things, like light in the darkness, they were followed by periods of deeper gloom. Apostacy from God has its reward, both now and in the world to come. The beginning of the fulfillment of the warnings of the Lawgiver is at hand. After a history and separate existence of 253 years the kingdom of Israel was blotted out. The record of its extinction is terse and graphic: "In the ninth year of Hoshea, the king of Assyria took Samaria and carried Israel away into Assyria, and placed them in Halah and in Habor by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes. For so it was that the children of Israel had sinned against the Lord their God * * And walked in the statues of the heathen. * * Yet the Lord testified against Israel * * by the prophets and by all the

seers: * * Notwithstanding they would not hear * * and they rejected his statutes * * and they followed vanity, and became vain, and went after the heathen. * * Therefore the Lord was very angry with Israel, and removed them out of his sight: there was none left but the tribe of Judah only," (2 Kings 17 : 6–19). To prevent further trouble with the Samaritans the Assyrian king "brought men from Babylon and from Cuthah, and from Ava, and from Hamath, and from Sepharvaim and placed them in the cities of Samaria instead of the children of Israel: and they possessed Samaria and dwelt in the cities thereof." Could a record be briefer or more expressive? and yet it tells, most eloquently, the story of Israel's shame and punishment. To Judah a longer lease of life is given, even though it was written: "Also Judah kept not the commandments of the Lord their God, but walked in the statutes of Israel which they made." In the year 722 B. C., the Assyrian overthrew Israel, and but little over a hundred years elapse, until in 606 Judah begins to fulfill prophecy in suffering the consequences of her sins. During the reign of Jehoiakim, in the eleventh year of his reign, Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, to whom Jehoiakim had three years before surrendered Jerusalem, but against whom he had revolted, appeared for the second time before Jerusalem. Jehoiakim's capitulation did not serve to stay the wrath of the victor, who put the Jewish king to death and cast his body in disgrace beyond the gate of the city. Moreover Nebuchadnezzar carried to Babylon and the house of his god,—"part of the vessels of the house of God" and a number of captives—distinguished men and promising youth. According to Josephus these were 3000 in number. Among them were included Ezekiel, Daniel and his companions, and others. (Ez. 1 : 1–3; Dan. 1 : 1–4; Josep. Ant. B. 10 : 6 : 3).

Jehoiachin son of Jehoiakim was elevated to the Jewish throne, but for some reason was permitted to retain his honors but for a few months. (599). Nebuchadnezzar again appeared before the city: the king offered no resistance, but was dethroned, and carried into captivity, together with his mother and all his household. At this time too, the temple was despoiled of many

of its treasures, and more than ten thousand of the principal persons of the city, including "all the mighty men of valor, even ten thousand captives and all the craftsmen and smiths."

Nebuchadnezzar then raised Mattaniah, the brother of Jehoiakim, to the throne, changing his name to Zedekiah—the Lord is righteousness—pledging him to be faithful to the trust committed to him. (598). But Zedekiah fell into the sins of his predecessors, and the judgment which comes to him is implied in the charge recorded against him, as it is written: "And he did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord." Under the influence of evil and notwithstanding the remonstrances of the prophet Jeremiah, he rebelled against Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, and the most powerful monarch of his time. And this king came up against Jerusalem with his armies and besieged it. The particulars of its capture do not fall within the province of my present purpose, and will therefore be omitted. Suffice it to say that Zedekiah was in no way able to cope with the eastern monarch, and that as he had sown so did he reap.

Not only irritated and annoyed, Nebuchadnezzar must have been furious in his anger at the insignificant and turbulent Jewish state, which while without power to cause him serious harm was yet a breeder of rebellion and discord, and a source of constant annoyance, an uncertain political element even in those times of uncertainty and instability when success of arms resting on a warlike soldier meant the reversal, or at least the destruction, of the existing order of state and society. Within thirteen years the Kings of Judah had rebelled *four* times, and shall we wonder that despairing of obtaining anything better from the Jewish state, the victor executed condign judgment upon it: as it is written Nebuchadnezzar "burnt the house of the Lord, and the king's house and all the houses of Jerusalem. * * And * * brake down the walls of Jerusalem round about." And the rest of the people in the city, and the fugitives * * with the remnant of the multitude, all but the poor of the land who were left to be vinedressers and husbandmen were carried into captivity. Every thing that was of value was taken, and the great city; the wonderful city; the *city of the great king* was left in desolation and ruins. (588). The temple

of the living God, that wonderful building upon which Solomon lavished the resources of his kingdom, and the brightness of which as it raised itself aloft in the light of the burning sun, dazzled the eye; which was the joy and pride of a nation, and to it the visible symbol of the presence of their God with them, was burned to the ground; and Jerusalem became, because of her sins, "heaps, and a den of dragons." (Jer. 9 : 11). The royal family fared hardly: (2 Kings 14) taken to Babylon by the command of the king the sons of Zedekiah were slain before his eyes, his own eyes put out and he was kept a captive till his death. (Jer. 39).

Thus was the land left in desolation and the people whom David had led to victory, and over whom Solomon had judged, were brought to naught. Over the poor of the land who yet remained was placed a Jewish governor whose duty it was to protect the people as they had need, and to collect the king's revenues; but the glory of the land had departed, and in another land the captive people were learning what it meant to disobey their God and to depart from the way of his pleasure. For seventy years the captivity is to continue and then, in the fulness of his mercy and according to the purposes of his Providence, the people are to return, humbled and chastened; repentant prodigals to their Father's house to renew under divine guidance the execution of his pleasure and their struggle unto the attainment of better things to be had of God, as in time past, only by submission to his designs concerning them. But let us pass over the condition of the land of the Israelites during the period of the Captivity, and over the history of the captives themselves, and examine briefly the conditions which excited in the heart of Nehemiah the desire to give himself to the work of the restoration and the rehabilitation of his native land.

In the first year, (536 B. C.), of the reign of Cyrus, to whose military genius and sagacity the great city of Babylon, with its impregnable defenses, succumbed, and in the seventieth year of the captivity of Judah, the king made proclamation permitting the Jews, for it was about this time that this name was given to them, not only to return with their possessions but commanding that help should be given them, and free will offerings for the

rebuilding of the temple. And when the people under the leadership of Zerubbabel, a prince of the royal house, and a grandson of Jehoiachin—and Jeshua the high-priest, were ready to set forth the king brought forth the vessels of the house of the Lord, which had been brought from Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, five thousand and four hundred in number and restored them to the joyful Israelites. (Ezra 1 : 11). The number of those who returned to the land of their fathers was about 50,000; on their arrival in Judah steps were at once taken to restore, from the existing confusion, order and unity. Offerings were made for the rebuilding of the temple; sacrifice was offered up according to the law; the feasts were observed; the priesthood was purged of all who could not trace their genealogy to the proper source, and in the second month of the second year of their coming unto the house of God in Jerusalem, work was begun for the restoration of the temple.

It was an event not unmixed with sorrow. By the younger ones who had not seen the temple the laying of the foundations was hailed with acclamations of joy; but those who were familiar with the glory of the past were moved by the overpowering character of their recollections to tears; "So that the people could not discern the noise of the shout of joy from the noise of the weeping of the people." But the inauguration of works of righteousness are never unaccompanied by the hindrances of sin. Many years before, by Moses (Deut. 7) and Joshua, (Joshua 23), Israel had been warned from making common cause with heathen peoples, but never till now was the danger of such alliances correctly apprehended. When, therefore, the remnants of the ten tribes, or the admixture which resulted from the fusion with the heathen peoples which the Assyrian conqueror had caused to be colonized in Samaria—offered their services, and desired to join in the erection of the temple, they were refused and the individuality of the Jewish people asserted, together with the separatistic tendencies which have since characterized them as a people. The sequence to this policy—which was the true one—was easy to fore-cast. By rejecting the proffered aid of the Samaritans their enmity was invoked and with diligence and with some success they labored to prevent the rebuilding of

the temple. Nor did they scruple to resort to any means, nor to use any agency whereby to accomplish their purpose. But they fight in vain who would prevail against God. Because the Lord uses human agencies in the workings of his Providence as exercised among men, and because that these are susceptible to the temptations of the flesh, his purposes concerning the welfare of his people may be delayed, their power to some extent nullified, yet his pleasure can never be thwarted nor his ends defeated; the very disturbing powers, little as they have, or do desire it, conducing toward the advancement of his designs, and redounding to the glory of his name.

The work of rebuilding was vigorously prosecuted, but it is written: "The people of the land weakened the hands of the people of Judah, and troubled them in building." In other words, inspired by anger, envy and malice, the Samaritans conspired with the enemies of Judah to defeat their purpose and to retard their work.

During the reign of Cyrus the conspirators prevailed nothing against Judah. After Ahasuerus the son of Cyrus, called Cambyses in profane history, ascended the throne, like appeals were made to him to stop the work on the temple; and many specious arguments were used to persuade him, but without success. "Their representations," says Rawlinson,* "had no effect on Cambyses." Others, however, date the beginning of the interruption suffered by the Jews in rebuilding the temble from the reign of this king; but with what authority I am unable to say. The whole history of this king relative to the matter in question, recorded by sacred historians, seems to be that contained in Ezra 4 : 6, and this does not, in the least, imply an interruption at the hands of Ahasuerus. Josephus, however, states that by this king command was given to prohibit the work of rebuilding at Jerusalem. So also Kurtz. (Sacred Hist., p. 247).

Whatever evidence there is to support the latter view must be found apart from the Scriptures. Cambyses' reign was brief: with his successor the Pseudo-Smerdis—the Artaxerxes of Ezra

*Fifth Monarchy, Chapter 7.

(Ez. 4 : 7–24)—a different result was had, and the king prohibited positively the continuation of the work. "Then," says Ezra, "ceased the work of the house of God which is at Jerusalem. So it ceased unto the second year of the reign of Darius king of Persia." In this year (521) in response to the prophetic exhortations of Haggai and Zechariah, the work was resumed. This led to inquiries on the part of the governor of the district west of Jordan, who came asking: "Who hath commanded you to build this house and to make up this wall?" But God was with them and no interruption was suffered. Tatnai, the governor, communicated with the king, who caused search to be made for the decree of Cyrus, by which the Jews claimed to be authorized to continue and complete the work with which they were engaged. By the resumption of the work at the direction of the prophets we have, I think, testimony which sustains the view taken by Rawlinson, that the Jews suffered nothing at the hands of Cambyses. A prohibition emanating from him would have had a continuing power; it would have been a constant prohibition. But the injunction of the Pseudo-Smerdis, from the fact that he was not the legal king, might for that reason be disregarded without incurring the displeasure of the rightful ruler, and without risking even the imputation of disrespecting the royal decrees. Were it otherwise, had the prohibition of work been by Cambyses, it could not have been resumed without royal permission, but by what would virtually amount to rebellion, even though it did not consist in armed defiance of the Persian throne.

Hence we must conclude, I think, both from the act of the Jews in resuming the work forbidden by Artaxerxes, and from their answer to the enquiries of Tatnai, the governor, that their work was not jealously regarded by Cambyses, Cyrus' son. The search ordered by Darius resulted in the discovery of the decree made by Cyrus, its confirmation, with the addition that it was to be speedily carried out: together with a dreadful punishment to be visited upon anyone who should alter or endeavor to negate the king's word. (Ezra 6).

Thus encouraged and aided, the rebuilding of the temple was completed in the sixth year of the reign of Darius, or in the

year, B. C., 516.* The festival of the dedication was celebrated with great joy by the faithful. Nearly sixty years after the dedication of the temple, in the seventh year of the reign of Artaxerxes king of Persia, Ezra, a scribe, the author of the book which bears this name, and a man who was evidently close to the king and highly regarded by him, receiving the royal permission, large liberty, and royal grants, gathered together a large company of Jews, with much treasure, and led them back to Jerusalem. (Ez. 7 : 8).

Of the interval between the completion of the temple, and the arrival of Ezra and his company we know but little. It is evident, however, that the people in Judah after a short time again suffered an admixture of races; and that having completed the temple they were laggard in forwarding the restoration of other important works; the rebuilding of the walls of the city made but indifferent headway. The people were harassed and plundered by the predatory raids of those with whom they had found no favor. In a condition of freedom, favored by the reigning powers, yet was their situation most unhappy; while the Jews and their rulers appear to have been inactive and nerveless. Apathy prevailed everywhere—the outward and invariable concomitant of declining faith. But God, the Lord God, is faithful; for he is the same to-day, yesterday and forever. Though his servants forget him; though they give themselves over to the distrust of unbelief in times of trial and darkness, yet that his mercies may be poured out upon them, does he reserve the few unto himself and because of them, and their continual cryings unto him in prayer, he spares the many who have deserved of him, by their apostacy and rebellion, naught but judgment and death.

The temple had been rebuilt; the larger part of the tribes of Benjamin and Judah had no doubt returned to Jerusalem and the country about the city; much had been done to improve their condition. It was as though the body of a people were there, but without vitality, supine and motionless. The flickering remnants of the vigorous faith and hopeful enthusiasm which

*According to Josephus the temple was finished in the ninth year of Darius, or 513 B. C. Antiq. Bk. XI, 4, 7.

rebuilt the temple, alone must have saved the people from utter despair, and its wavering flashes sustained and encouraged the despondent and doubtful. But in this hour it was, when hope and faith hung by a single thread, that the Lord raised up one who in hope, ability and faith was equal to the work to be wrought, and who by virtue of the acceptableness with the reigning powers which comes by righteousness was able with fervent patriotism and religious zeal, in the providence of God, to complete the work of restoration—the rebuilding of Jerusalem. The life and work of

NEHEMIAH THE PATRIOT

will now form the subject of our consideration, if it be that we may learn thereof unto a more perfect doing, a completer realization of the duties of life which are ours, with relation both to the Christian Church and a Christian State. One of the noblest of Old Testament characters, and one of the most interesting, but little is known of his birth and early history though he bears the significant name, Nehemiah, "the Lord comforteth."

From the book which bears his name, and of which he is the author, we obtain the meagre facts that are preserved to us in the biography of Nehemiah. He was the son of Hachaliah; of his parentage we know nothing more: of his father, his name alone is preserved to us, and even this distinction obtains to him through the greatness of his son. Whatever else may be said of the family and youth of Nehemiah must be conjecture or inference. Both conjecture and inference are legitimate reasoning processes, and from what is known of Nehemiah may be conjectured and inferred the, historically speaking, unknown: and the conclusions, conjectures or inferences arrived at must, if unconfirmed by other testimonies, still remain conjectural and inferential. If we are constrained to include what we know of the parentage of Nehemiah in a single sentence, it afford us reason to rejoice that meagre as are the facts in the history of his relation to the people of God, yet they are sufficient for our purpose; they are replete with instruction unto edification.

From the known we may infer with reasonable certainty much as to which scripture is silent. It has been conjectured that he

was of the tribe of Levi, but his declaration to Shemaiah, who proposed that he seek refuge from assassination within the temple (Neh. 6 : 10, 11), indicates that at least he was not of the priesthood, and probably not of the tribe of Levi; for while all were not priests yet the Levites might aspire to that honor. Rather more probable is the inference that Nehemiah belonged to the royal family of Judah. If not of this, he was evidently a member of a noble family. One of the exiles—a member of a captive nation—yet his person, demeanor and character, was such as to commend him to the distinguished favor of the Persian king, to the extent that he is made a member of the royal household and serves the king in the honorable and important office of "Cup-bearer." Just what the duties of this office were I have not been able to definitely determine. The office seems to have been the same as that of butler or steward (cf. Gen. 40 : 1 and 21) and to have been of special honor, responsibility, and an evidence of great regard and confidence.

It is certain that the Persian king would not have conferred this honorable office on a person of inferior birth or attainments; and we do know that it was not only customary, but that the Scriptures narrate instances where selections were made from the noble and royal families of captive people for service, not only in the king's household, but for honorable and even distinguished offices and duties about the person of the king. Wise in their day and generation were these oriental monarchs! For to so do would serve to make influential friends among captives and to an extent to reconcile them to captivity. The custom was also a convenient one; for it would debar from places of responsibility persons who might conspire to seize the throne and murder the king.

As we have noticed when Nebuchadnezzar first appeared before Jerusalem he carried away with him to Babylon "certain of the children of Israel, and of the king's seed, and of the princes; children in whom was no blemish, but well favored and skillful in all wisdom; and cunning in knowledge, and understanding science, and such as had ability in them to stand in the king's palace." (Dan. 1 : 3, 4; Lev. 24 : 19, 20). Nehemiah

was doubtless likewise selected to serve the king; it was no doubt due with him, as in other instances, to his disposition and amiability, his character and devotion to the religion of his fathers, that he won the love and favor of his sovereigns, and received at their hands so many marks of good will and trust.

And because of these characteristic and distinguishing traits, which he possessed as did few before him, and probably fewer after him, he was enabled to become, in the providence of God, to Judah—the chosen people—more than was Washington, Lincoln or Grant to the United States; Wellington to England and Europe; Peter the Great to Russia; or Emperor William of Germany to a united fatherland. In modern history there is, I believe, but one man whose character unites in itself to even a moderate extent, the distinguished abilities in the domains of politics and religion, of Nehemiah, and that is the great protector—Oliver Cromwell.

As by the contemplation of noble works we are moved to strive to emulate them; or as by the beauty of holiness sin becomes repulsive to us; as the recital or narration of the philanthropic and righteous inspires to generous rivalry, so let the motives and attainments, the devotion and loyalty of Nehemiah find expression in our lives, that as faithful and devoted to our Great High Priest we may with all diligence and zeal promote the upbuilding of the walls of Zion and the extension of the reign of the Son of Man over the hearts and minds of the creatures of his handiwork. We have considered the early history of our hero; we have seen something of his true individuality; let us now turn our attention to the work of his life: that great work—the rehabilitation of the people of God, as a nation and as a church—to which he was certainly called, and for the doing of which he bore not only the commission and enjoyed the favor of Artaxerxes Longimanus—king of the Medes and Persians—but also of one far, yea, infinitely greater than any of earth's potentates, for He is the King of kings, and *the Lord* of lords; the great and exceeding Mighty One, who alone can say of himself, "*I am that I am*, and who doth as it pleaseth him, in the heavens, and in the earth, in the sea, and in all deep places." In Him only is strength; in Him did Nehemiah find support

and comfort. In the more careful analysis which we are to make of Nehemiah let us consider, first,

HIS CALL TO DUTY.

In the month of Chisleu—corresponding to the latter half of November and the first half of December according to our calendar—of the 20th year of Artaxerxes, or B. C. 446, Nehemiah was in Shushan the palace, or as Josephus says: was walking about before the walls—probably near the principal gate of the city, at the time of the arrival of a number of Jews from Jerusalem. Observing them to be of his nation he went to them and asked concerning the condition of the people in Jerusalem, and of the state of the city. Their reply caused him the deepest sorrow, for as we have seen, it was discouraging in the extreme. And it came to pass, said Nehemiah, that when I heard these words I sat down and wept, and mourned certain days, and fasted, and prayed before the God of heaven." Nehemiah had received his call! its ground, objectively speaking, was found in the necessities of his countrymen; its avenue of communication was through Hanani, and his fellow travelers, who had probably come from Judah to appeal to the king's cupbearer for help in the hour of their distress. In two places Nehemiah calls Hanani his brother; the use of the word among oriental peoples is so indefinite however that we are hardly justified in believing that the stricter construction—a child of the same parents—is to be put upon this expression. At all events it is probable that these men were related by ties of blood; and therefore no less likely that Hanani headed a mission, whether it was by authority, or not, we can only conjecture, to Nehemiah, the object of which was to invoke his well known influence with the king in behalf of a disconsolate people.

Providentially Nehemiah was met, at the gate (shall we say?), and seeks of them the very information that they are come to impart. The call thus objectively extended produces in Nehemiah its legitimate effect. His qualifications for the work are intuitively recognized, though not directly expressed. A response is invoked; it is immediate and unconditional. Would that in general men, who bear the name of the living God, and

profess to do his will, would do likewise, and nobly rise at the call of duty to the full measure of godly manhood exhibited by Nehemiah, and as the work of the kingdom of God is indicated to them respond to the utmost; then as we shall see that the *Lord God* was with Nehemiah in the great work to which he was called, so would he be with his servants of this day and generation unto the *speedy* consummation of his purposes—the overthrow of evil,—the triumph of the Church Militant, and the second and glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ.

Recognizing the difficulties which are likely to present themselves, and faithful to the import of his name Nehemiah seeks, with fasting and prayer, the favorable consideration of his master the king of Persia, at the hands of the Lord. Nor does he seek in vain: his sad countenance attracts the attention of the king, as he passes in an out before him in the performance of the duties of his office. The king graciously inquired the reason of his grief. Then says Nehemiah I was very sore afraid. But he replies: "Let the king live forever: why should not my countenance be sad, when the city, the place of my father's sepulchres lieth waste, and the gates thereof are consumed with fire?" And the king said, "For what dost thou make request?" Then prayed Nehemiah to God and said, "If it please the king, and if thy servant have found favor in thy sight, that thou wouldst send me unto Judah unto the city of my fathers' sepulchres that I may build it." And God increased Nehemiah in the favor of the king, and it was given to him even as he desired; letters to the proper authorities, large liberties, powers and grants. Nor does he forget to ascribe the favors received to their proper source, for he says, "And the king granted me according to the good hand of my God upon me," thus presaging the completer declaration of James that "every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning."

Nehemiah lost no time in proceeding to Jerusalem, accompanied, no doubt, by many of the Jews who thus took occasion to return to their own country. (Josep. Bk. XI., 5–7). Arriving

at Jerusalem he dwelt there three days before taking any action; this time was probably spent in inquiring into the condition of the city and its inhabitants without disclosing the real object of his mission. Having ascertained the internal status of affairs he rose up by night, accompanied by a few of his attendants, and made a secret survey of the walls of the city, nearly compassing the city, and returning by the same gate which gave them egress. His next act was to call a council, or assemble the leader and rulers, and to say to them: "Ye see the distress that we are in, how Jerusalem lieth waste, and the gates thereof are burned with fire: come, and let us build the wall of Jerusalem, that we be no more a reproach." (Neh. 11 : 17). And Nehemiah encouraged them until animated by his own enthusiasm and fired by his own zeal, they said: "Let us arise and build." And they set about this good work at once, thus evincing their faith in God, and the leader sent of him, that his people might be persuaded unto the fulfillment of his own good pleasure.

Again the hand of the adversary is raised against them. The motley company of the Samaritans all aflame with envy and jealousy renewed their hostility, and animated by the assurance lent them by previous success, laughed the Jews to scorn, despised them, and, as is the way with evil, imputed to them motives of rankest ingratitude and foulest treachery to the government to which they owed their freedom, together with innumerable favors, of priceless value. "Ah! Ah!" they cried, "What is this thing that ye do? will ye *rebel* against the king?" And may we not learn a lesson here? How often may we not see the same disposition of the wicked one manifest in the lives of men as for one reason or another, evil takes occasion of ascribing to persons and institutions called Christian, animating principles that are far, often as far as is the east from the west, from being the true ones. Under such circumstances, however, men must not stop to justify their actions, but conscious of their own integrity as did Nehemiah, so must they say, "The God of heaven he will prosper us: therefore we his servants will arise and build: but ye have no portion, nor right, nor memorial, in Jerusalem.

Entering upon the work of rebuilding the walls it is prosecu-

ted with great vigor; and with an earnestness and success that accompanies executive ability of the highest order. The work was divided among the people in fair proportion. Nor was Nehemiah backward in this matter: he not only remitted to the people the support which belonged to him as governor, which amounted to no inconsiderable sum both of money and provisions, but he employed all his household in the interests of the common cause, and fed at his table during this time "an hundred and fifty of the Jews and rulers, besides others who were employed in the work of restoration. The news of the inauguration and progress of the work reaches Sanballat, who seems to have been a leader among, or the leader of the opposition headed by the Samaritans. It excites him to anger and indignation, and he mocked the Jews; he incites his people to armed hostility, and they conspired to fight against Jerusalem. But Nehemiah was not dismayed; he knew in whom he trusted, that he would not permit his work to be stopped, nor his people discouraged above that which they were able to bear with profit. The enemy mocked, and raged, and conspired to overthrow and to tear down; they made light of the efforts to rebuild the wall, and said, "Even that which they build, if a fox go up, he shall even break down their stone wall." But while the Samaritans were thus engaged, the Jews were busily at work night and day. Every opportunity was employed, every advantage availed of to forward the work, and, says Nehemiah, "We made our prayer unto our God, and set a watch against them—the conspirators—night and day." The result is easily foreseen. Their cause was the Lord's; among themselves not a duty was neglected nor overlooked, the plans of the enemy were constantly noted, and last of all, and best of all, they put their trust in Him who had chosen their father Abraham, had delivered them from Egypt; had restored them from their captivity; had enabled them to rebuild the temple; and now through his servant Nehemiah was leading them back to a national consciousness and a national existence.

The glory of the past was gone forever, but the future yet offered to and contained for them more significant and more greatly to be desired consequences. Though the Ark and its

treasures were lost to them, and the Holy of Holies was a vacant place, and the priests were constrained to use strange fire on the alter, yet the prophets spake of new and unwonted things, —of the Sceptre which should rise out of Judah, and the Star out of Jacob, of the person and work, the glories and triumphs of the promised Messiah who will assure to the temple a glory like unto which the world had never beheld, so that, "the glory of this latter house shall be greater than the former," and the chosen ones will have part in great events whose importance will overshadow them forever.

But all was not yet; the enemies arranged to surprise and destroy the Jews, but God gave Nehemiah knowledge of their plans, and he says: "Therefore set I in the lower places behind the wall, and on the higher places * * the people after their families with their swords, their spears and their bows." And he encouraged them all, and exhorted them to remember their God, and to fight for their brethren, sons, daughters, wives and houses. Discovering that their plans were known of the Jews the adversaries gave over their attempt to surprise them and probably retired. Nehemiah did not, however, relax his precautions. Redoubling his efforts he directed that with weapons and armor in convenient reach, all should by day and by night prosecute the work in which they were engaged. And "They which builded on the wall, and they that bare burdens, with those that laded, every one with one of his hands wrought in the work, and with the other hand held a weapon. For the builders, every one had his sword girded by his side, and so builded."

In view of the extensive space over which the people were working, the command was, "In what place, therefore, ye hear the sound of the trumpet, resort ye thither. unto us: our God shall fight for us." Wise and capable as he was, possessed with a faith that knew no fear, confident of the support and protection of the heavenly Father, Nehemiah took nothing for granted. So unremittingly did he labor that he says: "Neither I, nor my brethren, nor my servants, nor the men of the guard which followed me, none of us put off our clothes, save that every one put them off for washing." While thus burdened by the de-

mands of the military exigencies of the hour, the civil affairs of the Jews required hardly less attention. As might be expected, and is usual under such circumstances, there were among the people persons so blind to the calls of patriotism, and unfaithful to the law and to God, that by usury and extortion they waxed rich because of the great need of their brethren. This matter coming to the ears of Nehemiah he set about a correction of the scandal so vigorously as to bring to pass a complete restoration of moneys and lands wrongfully acquired.

In strong contrast to those who thrived on the necessities of others, was his own example. Other governors had compelled the people to surport them and their households. But during the time of his first government—twelve years—he not only did not require tribute of the people, but supporting his own establishment, he and his servants devoted themselves to the work of reconstruction. "Moreover," he says, "there were at my table an hundred and fifty of the Jews and rulers, besides those that came unto us from among the heathen that are about us." Shall we wonder then that the work of rebuilding the walls, prosecuted by such a devoted and self-sacrificing leader, gigantic undertaking though it was, was speedily carried to a successful consummation? Despite of its difficulties; of treachery and lukewarmness within and armed opposition without, the walls of Jerusalem—by pre-eminence the city of the great King—was restored and put in a defensible condition in *fifty and two days.**

Within two months after he had assumed the reins of power Nehemiah wrought this great work. But all was not yet finished. In truth the greater task yet remained to him. The state and the Church required a reorganization which amounted to a virtual renewal. But sustained by the power of God and the stimulating inspiration of a high and holy purpose Nehemiah, the Tirshatha, set about the regeneration of his people. Putting competent and faithful men over Jerusalem, he made a record of the people by families; and of the priests. (Neh. 7).

---

*The statement of Josephus, Antiq. Book XI., 5. 8, is strangely out of accord with the text of the Scriptures. Nehemiah's statements are clear and definite. Neh. 2 : 1 ; 13 : 6.

From the latter he put out all whose genealogy was not satisfactory, and assigned them to their own cities.

Religious instruction followed upon the introduction of law and order. The people came together as one man, and Ezra, the scribe, brought the law before the congregation, both men and women, and all that could hear with understanding. * * And he read therein * * from the morning till midday * * and the ears of all the people were attentive unto the book of the law. The people repenting renewed their vows unto God. Confession was made of sin and wickedness; God's goodness and faithfulness were declared and the people renewed their covenant with God, that they would walk in his way, which was given by Moses the servant of God and to observe and do what was written therein. The restoration of Church and state having been completed, at the end of twelve years Nehemiah returned to the service of the king Artaxerxes. But his heart was with the people of God, and it was, without doubt, with a fatherly solicitude that he followed the course of events in Judea. The necessity of his return soon became apparent and his earnest entreaties again prevailed with the king. It was probably in the year 432 that he returned to Jerusalem only to find, O bitter experience! the temple polluted, and that the Levites and singers, that did the work in the temple, had fled every one to his own field, for their portions, their living—as provided by the law had not been given them.*

*I am aware that a much longer time is usually named, during which Nehemiah was absent from Jerusalem, but, so far as I have been able to determine with the means at hand, without authority. Certain it is that Artaxerxes Longimanus ascended the Persian throne in 465 B. C. He reigned 40 years and died in 425 B. C. Darius Nothos (called before his ascension, Ochus) assumed the reins of government in 424. During the reign of Darius Nothos it has been generally considered that Nehemiah returned the second time to Jerusalem. But this does not seem probable. The phrase "after certain days," or *at the end of days*, as in the margin, seems to be the same as that in Neh. 1 : 4. True, both expressions are indefinite, but it seems to us, that in view of what has been said, that 432 was the most probable date of Nehemiah's return to Jerusalem. The only textual evidence of a longer absence is found in the corruption of the temple and the departure of the Levites from service at the temple, for

Again he restores the worship of the temple to its normal condition, and makes renewed provision for those who there ministered in holy things. So potent was his influence, so profoundly did he impress himself upon the Jewish Church and state that as he left it, it persisted until the coming of the Messiah. To be sure he received great help from Ezra and others; but genius is no less truly displayed in the selection of helpers than in the origination of great works. Fertile in resources, an organizer of the first rank, Nehemiah was no less successful in executing that which his genius and inspiration had wrought out in thought and embodied in needful organisms. Measured by what he accomplished in his self-sacrificing devotion to a high and holy cause—God and his nation—the truest test of real greatness. His was a great and noble life. Though his sphere of action was constrained and narrow, he must be included in the first rank of statesmen and military chieftains.

As an example of religious devotion and of patriotism he should be better known and more carefully studied; then he will receive a due measure of popular appreciation, and then only; and his character, which is without a stain, will lead and encourage others to strive to excel in well-doing in the service of God, and of native land. Would God that in all of the departments of human activity there were more Nehemiahs to inspire and urge purity of purpose and sacrifice of self and the world in seeking first the kingdom of God and his righteousness. Of Nehemiah, the devout, the magnanimous, the soldier and statesman, one of his countrymen has said: "He was a man of a good and a righteous disposition, and very ambitious to make his own nation happy; and he hath left the walls of Jerusalem as an eternal monument for himself."* More than this, better than this, cannot be said of the work of any man.

But alas! for monuments of human building. It is not by

---

want of a proper support. This might have occurred soon after Nehemiah departed, supposing Eliashib to be a corrupt man, as he appears to have been. (See Conversations on the Bible, p. 402; Sacred History, Kurtz, p. 248; Rawlinson's Fifth Monarchy, chap. 7; Encyclo. Britannica, vols. 2 and 6.

*Jos. Antiq., Bk. XI., 5, 8

the work of his hands that the memory of Nehemiah is perpetuated; nay for all things material are marked by the mutations of time: but rather for his devotion to duty and his faithfulness to the purpose and will of the Lord. The widow casting her mite into the treasury builded not in stone or iron, but made sure for herself a character that will be extolled wherever is told the story of the Cross. Of the death of Nehemiah we have no authentic account. As has been said our certain knowledge of him is wholly derived from the book which bears his name. Perhaps, and probably, all that can be said is as has been said, that, *"when Nehemiah had done many other excellent things, and many worthy of commendation in a glorious manner, he came to a great age and then died." Such were the works and attainments of Nehemiah. His life, and works, will not only bear inspection, but it invites study and analysis.

THE SUPREME MOTIVES OF HIS LIFE

are to be found in his love for God and his neighbors—*i. e.*, his countrymen. All of his enthusiasms were in the line of duty; all of his acts were in conformance thereto. Whatsoever he did in word or deed was referable to the supreme motive—love of God and the advancement of his pleasure among his people. In him the devotional and the patriotic mutually subserved the glory of God and found harmonious expression in two directions. (I). In his efforts in behalf of the external fabric—the material vehicle—whereby the oracles of God were preserved, and made to minister unto the salvation of men. He gave it stability; he inspired it with his own unquenchable enthusiasm, wrought out unanimity of purpose and concert in action, and thereby begat courage and power of defense. He perpetuated this condition by the distribution and equalization of burdens and the restoration of pure religion. (II). In his love for God he cleansed the temple and enforced the law. The ministers of the temple were sustained by the temporal offerings enjoined. Confusion and discord gave place to order and concord.

The Jewish Church and state were prepared unto the coming of the troublous times which followed, but strong in their re-

*Jos. Antiq., Bk. XI., 5, 8.

generation they persisted and the Church persists; while to-day Nehemiah in his unique personality towers above the leaders of the past who have followed him, as uniting in himself, with purest patriotism and most unselfish devotion to the service of his Lord, the cardinal elements which go to make men truly great in civil, military and religious life. To him, as such, let us pay tribute of respect and admiration. Though his name and deeds have been unheralded by poetic genius; though untold and unpraised by flights of eloquent oratory, let us not be deterred from recognizing his greatness or his godliness. But to him as a father in the Church of our Lord let us do him honor and ourselves the credit of well-doing, by striving with all zeal and diligence to imitate his devotion to righteousness and truth in all of our relations to Church and State.

ARTICLE IV.

EDUCATING MEN FOR THE MINISTRY.*

By Prof. P. M. Bikle, Ph. D., Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg.

The grandest commission ever given to men was that given by the Lord Jesus Christ to his eleven disciples, after his resurrection: "*Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature.*" In its source it is the divinest; in its scope it is the widest; in its duration it is the longest. It comes from the Son of God; it embraces the world; it is in force for all time. Men have been entrusted with high commissions from earth's potentates in the interest of their respective nations; but this comes from the King of kings and its object is the eternal welfare of all mankind.

The eleven, to whom this great commission was directly given, labored and suffered to the full measure of devotion in carrying it out. It was transmitted in all its original force to their successors. The workmen died but the work went on. The same commission has come down through the centuries to the Church

*Address delivered before the Ev. Luth. Synod of Maryland, and published at the suggestion of some of the members.

of to-day. It has lost none of its dignity and none of its binding obligation. It faces us with all its divine character and sublimity, and we must face it with the spirit of earnest resolve and self-sacrifice that characterized those to whom it was first given, if we would be their worthy successors and do our duty. As they preached the Gospel faithfully and well, and kept up the line of succession, so must we. We must not only proclaim the Gospel but make provision, too, that, when we are gone, the work may still go on. When we die, the work must not die with us. On the other hand, as men drop from the ranks, their places must be supplied with other men. More than this, the ranks must be swelled from year to year, if the number of laborers is to be at all commensurate with the work to be done.

THE URGENT DEMAND FOR MEN.

Christ in his day, when he saw the multitudes, was moved with compassion for them, because they were distressed and scattered, as sheep not having a shepherd. (R. V.) That same condition of things prevails now as then, and the compassionate heart of the Saviour is moved just as deeply by it. He also said to his disciples: "The harvest truly is plenteous but the laborers are few." That was true then; it is true now. In view of this greatness of harvest and fewness of laborers, he commanded the disciples to pray the Lord to send forth laborers into his harvest. That command was called forth by the same conditions then as we find now, and is just as applicable to us as to the early disciples.

The greatness of the harvest. Need we go with you to some high point of outlook and take a careful view of the vastness of the field? Has not this been done over and over again when the call to mission work has been proclaimed? Have you not seen that at least two-thirds of our fellow-men are enveloped in a darkness that the light of the precious Gospel has not yet penetrated? And have you not heard the calls for more men who shall carry the lamp of truth and the light of life to dispel this darkness? India, with her 250,000,000, calls; China, with her 300,000,000, calls; Africa, with her 200,000,000, calls. The efforts in answering these calls, during this century, have been

vigorous and, in a gratifying measure, successful. Opposition is diminishing; sympathy with the work is increasing; conditions are more favorable than at any previous epoch; and yet, after all that has been done, we can call into line less than 3,000,000 of Christians in Pagan and Mohammedan countries, while behind is an enormous phalanx of about a thousand millions, made up of different nations and races—a dense and almost illimitable mass—still unchanged by the Gospel. "Men and money," "Men and money"—this has been the cry for years and is the cry now.

And if there is a denomination in any land that has a specially wide field open for it in its own country, that denomination is the Lutheran Church in the United States. The four Churches of German origin in our country—Lutheran, Reformed, Moravian and Evangelical Union of the West—have about 1,150,000 members. The Lutheran Church has more than three-fourths of this membership, or more than three times as many as the other three combined. There are constant accessions from immigration. About one-eighth of our whole population is of Teutonic origin, and now numbers nearly 7,000,000. Here is material for our Church and a call for men to gather them into congregations and care for them. Many of them belong to our fold and most of them would naturally affiliate with us, but if they are long scattered, as sheep having no shepherd, they will be lost to the Church and to God. And if they are so lost, it will be a disaster not only to themselves but to our country as well. A godly German is one of the best and most reliable citizens we have, a man whom you always know where to find; but an ungodly one has not his equal for evil in any other nationality, having in him the make-up of an anarchist of the first class. For the sake of the country, if for nothing else, we should try to make him a Christian.

Now to the Germans add the Swedes, the Norwegians, the Danes and other immigrants from Lutheran peoples on the other side of the globe. Bear in mind, too, the rapid increase of the families of these foreigners, and the necessity of building new churches to care for the overflows. Then, also, remember the divisions of large, long-settled pastorates into two or three

smaller ones. Take all these things into consideration, and you will see the reason why there is a constant call for more men, *more men.* The harvest is plenteous.

Now look, for a moment, at the relation of the General Synod to all these masses. This brings us nearer home and squarely before our own work in educating men for the ministry. When we look to the future, there is no question but that we occupy a vantage ground above all the general bodies in the Lutheran Church. These foreign people must eventually become Anglicised. In the very nature of the case it cannot be otherwise. As this process goes on the tendency will naturally be towards the General Synod, unless the other general bodies become wiser than they have been. To those acquainted with the situation there is no need of argument to show this. It is only a question whether the Synods of the General Synod will take in the situation and prepare to meet it. If we have not the men to gather the young people into English congregations, the opportunity which is sure to come will also go again, leaving nothing but barren regrets.

WHAT WE ARE DOING TO MEET THE DEMAND.

Now what are we of the General Synod doing to meet the demands of this great world-field of which we have spoken, and of this great home-field just now mentioned, which is increasing so rapidly year by year? What are we doing? Men by the hundreds are needed every year. Are we sending them into the field in such numbers, or are we counting them only by the scores and tens? The sad fact stares us in the face, that the number of those who bear their own expense, in preparing for the work of the ministry, is not equal to the number who drop from the ranks by death. The General Council and the Synodical Conference receive accessions from foreign countries, but not so with the General Synod. We must depend upon those who are educated within our own borders. What are we doing to make up the death loss and to meet the growing demands of our ever widening field? I do not propose to answer this question in detail, but only in a general way and briefly.

Some aid was given to young men before, by a few of the

Synods, but scarcely worth mentioning, but in 1836 the work took more definite shape. In that year the General Synod, realizing that it could not carry on its work with any degree of efficiency, if it depended solely on those who bore the expense of their education for the ministry, organized an Education Society, whose object was to aid worthy young men of limited means in preparing for the work. As this was found, after some years' experience, to be unwieldy and as lacking that close oversight of the young men there should be, the work of aiding candidates for the ministry, after receiving a decided impulse to larger effort, was again committed to the individual Synods, the general society continuing, however, under the name of Parent Education Society, in order to care for certain funds entrusted to it, and to appropriate the interest to ministerial education. The Executive Committee of this Society has been administering these funds, and also some bequests and contributions, in aiding young men, being able some years to give much needed help to eight or ten. Nearly the whole of the work, however, is now done by the respective synods, and nearly every one has a standing Education Committee. In this way the accessions are kept above the losses by death and our Church is enabled to make some progress.

But how insignificant, after all, is the work we are doing! The laborers still are few. How many men, for instance, are ordained each year by the great Synods of Maryland, West Pennsylvania and East Pennsylvania? These Synods have more than 200 ministers and about 50,000 communicant members, and yet all three do not ordain, on an average, more than ten men a year. And remember that these ten embrace those who have been helped by the Church.* And yet these are

*In an article contributed by Prof. E. S. Breidenbaugh to the *Lutheran Observer* of Oct. 1, 1886, on "Some Facts in Reference to Beneficiary Education," we find some statistics collated by Oscar G. Klinger, A. B., a student in the Gettysburg Theological Seminary, which show what some of our synods are doing. We give them here along with the explanatory part of the article:

"Herewith is presented a table which gives information concerning the work of the synods which have a more intimate connection with the institutions at Gettysburg and Selinsgrove. The tables show how many young

among the most active and liberal synods in the General Synod. When will the millennium come at this rate? What is this towards winning the world to Christ? What is this towards carrying out our grand commission to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature? Is there any evidence

---

men were receiving aid from each synod and from the Parent Education Society of the General Synod, each year, from 1879–80 to 1884–85. While most of these young men were at Gettysburg or Selinsgrove, a few were attending Roanoke College, Wittenberg College, or Howard University (young colored men). Of course, some of those aided dropped from the list without entering the ministry—some few because they were found unworthy, more because of developed physical disabilities. The tables also show the amounts of money raised by each synod during this period.

To these facts is added the number entering the ministry each year from the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg and from the Theological Department at Selinsgrove. The column 'total in six years,' does not mean that that number of persons was aided during the six years, but that that number of appropriations was made during the six years. These figures are obtained from the annual synodical minutes.

The nearest approximation obtainable shows that during these years *fifty* young men aided by the Church in this territory entered the ministry. This number of fifty is very near the exact number. During this same period, from the institutions in this same territory eighty-six entered the ministry. Three-fifths of the whole number were beneficiaries. Such figures are eloquent in showing the necessity of beneficiary education. Of the character of the men thus aided I would only say, "By their fruits ye shall know them."

STATISTICS OF BENEFICIARY EDUCATION.

SYNOD.	1879–80...	1880–81...	1881–82...	1882–83...	1883–84...	1884–85...	Total in six years.	Amounts raised 1879–1885.
Maryland,.....	8	12	13	15	11	7	66	$10076
West Pennsylvania,...	7	9	9	10	8	14	57	12961
East Pennsylvania,....	6	7	6	8	6	12	45	8195
Central Pennsylvania,	4	5	5	3	4	4	25	3806
Susquehanna,.....	6	6	4	7	6	7	36	†3210
Pittsburgh, ...	4	3	2	2	2	2	15	2875
Allegheny,.....	8	8	7	5	6	6	40	7357
Parent Education Soc.,	0	1	3	3	7	9	23	‡2478
Annual total,.....	43	51	49	53	50	61	307	$50958

ENTERING MINISTRY.

From	1879–80...	1880–81...	1881–82...	1882–83...	1883–84...	1884–85...	Total in six years
Gettysburg,...	13	10	11	15	8	12	69
Selinsgrove,...	5	..	4	2	3	3	17
Total,....	18	10	15	17	11	15	86

†This is based on the fact that for three years $1,605 were raised. Information concerning other three years is lacking.

‡The Parent Education Society also contributed $1,000 in aid of students in German Seminary at Chicago."

here that we are praying the Lord to send laborers into his harvest? Perhaps we are depending altogether on *praying* and look for the results with little or no *doing*. We may be like the man who was so absorbed in singing

> "Let the glorious Gospel fly
> The spacious earth around,"

that, with head thrown back and eyes to the ceiling, he failed to see the contribution basket that was passed around for the wherewithal to *make* the Gospel fly. We should pray, pray earnestly, persistently; but then we should also put ourselves in the hands of God to be used as instruments in answering the very prayers we offer. The harvest is plenteous, the laborers are few; let us pray the Lord of the harvest to send more laborers into his harvest; but then let us turn in and try to find the laborers. Our efforts without prayer will likely prove futile, for that is not the way we ought to work; and our prayers without effort will also likely prove futile, for that is not the way that God works. There is a marriage union between earnest prayer and faithful effort. If you divorce them, look for no good results.

If then, we would have a part worth speaking of in the great work of evangelizing the world, we must do better than we have been doing. It will never do to go on at our present rate. It is unworthy of the earnest and progressive spirit of these times. It is unworthy of the great commission we have from the divine Master. It is unworthy of us as believing Christians. It is unworthy of us as earnest men. We must do more to win worthy young men to the ranks of the ministry. If we can win those who can meet the expense of their education, well. If we can win those who are in less fortunate circumstances, let us help them in preparing for the work; and let us do it, too, in no niggardly way nor grudgingly, but cheerfully and to the extent of their need.

THE WORK OF SUPREME IMPORTANCE AND TO BE VIEWED FROM A BUSINESS STANDPOINT.

It is our conviction that this whole matter should be looked at largely from a business standpoint. The Great Head of the

Church has committed to the Church the business of winning souls to him. The broad harvest-field spreads out before us, inviting the reapers, and it is our business not only to go in ourselves but to see that others go in with us, and that present laborers have multiplied successors. It is only in this way that we can fulfill the great commission of going into all the world and preaching the Gospel to every creature.

This work of training men for the ministry is at the bottom of all mission work and all church extension work. What good will your tens of thousands of money do for missions if you have not the men to send? What use is there in building churches, if you have not the men to occupy their pulpits?

Educating men for the ministry should never be allowed to fall to a subordinate place in the benevolent work of the Church.*

---

*In the *New York Evangelist* for Oct. 21st, 1886, Rev. Charles B. Chapin, a member of the Presbyterian Board of Education, makes an earnest plea for the cause of ministerial education. On the relative importance of his Board with the others, he speaks as follows:

"We are well aware of the natural tendency of each Secretary or Presbyterial Committee to consider the Board represented by himself as having more pressing claims than the others. We shall try to avoid this tendency, being content with a simple statement that we would have accepted upon its merits only. The Board of Education should be rated as above all others in importance, except the Boards of Home and Foreign Missions. With these it should go hand in hand. The foundation for this statement rests upon the comparative *reach* of each. Home Missions, with its branch department Sustentation, is coterminous with our own land. The Board of Publication in its publishing, Sunday-school, and missionary work, is practically the same. So also is the Board of Church Erection. The Board of Freedmen is confined especially to our Southern States; the Board of Aid for Colleges especially to our West. Ministerial Relief (perhaps the most sacred of all) does not deal with a relatively large number of our ministers. The Board of Foreign Missions has as its field the foreign lands that at the same time are Christless. What are the limits of the Board of Education? The limits of the ministry itself, that go back of all the other Boards, and largely make them possible. She helps raise up teachers and professors for our schools and colleges, writers for Presbyterian publications, managers and secretaries for all our Boards. In short, to a certain extent, she goes deeper down than the rest: she goes to the fountain-head of all our work, to the Gospel ministry, and confines her efforts there."

Its importance should never be overshadowed by other departments of church work except as the foundation is covered by the super-structure. There is need of emphasizing this, if we are to learn a lesson from past experience and observation. We hear much of missions and church extension, and it is well that we do; but we hear relatively too little of the duty and importance of training men for preaching the Gospel. This is a poor way of being about our Father's business. It is not doing business in a business way. We are putting up a building without observing symmetrical proportions. We are developing the trunk of the body but allowing the legs to remain so weak that they cannot sustain it. All departments of church work should go together and preserve a rate of progress relatively proportionate. This is the part of wisdom. It is unwisdom to do otherwise.

Now, then, here is the work before us. The harvest is great, the laborers are few. Skilled labor is required here. If we depend upon those who have paid for their own training, we cannot make up ordinary losses. The work, instead of being progressive, will be retrogressive. What shall we do? Shall we fold our arms and whine that we are sorry there are not more men, fitted for the work, offering themselves for ordination; or shall we like men, entrusted with an important *business*, take some of the capital the Master has given us and invest it in the heart and brain of vigorous young men and fit them for the work? There are such young men all through the Church—young men of right character, healthy body, and good mental endowments, but with empty purse—who are perfectly willing to enter the ministry, if only a way is opened for them to fit themselves and be fitted for the work. Shall we not lay our hands on such, and say to each one: "Come, we will help you in securing an education. Do what you can yourself; we will supply the rest. We ask you in return to pledge yourself to the work of the Master in advancing his kingdom, and, if you fail, then refund what we give you with interest?" Is not this sensible? Is it not a good business method? It is furnishing the young man with means to secure an education and receiving in return the service of his whole life. The fact is, it is what

business men would call a 'No. 1' investment, whose percentage cannot be named with figures. The outcome in most cases is incalculable. Even in dollars and cents there is often a return, in a few years, of all that has been paid out—not perhaps from the young man's own pocket, for we do not require that (and we ought not require it), but from the new field which he has cultivated, or from the old field which he has developed. If it were necessary, we could cite particular instances showing this. We, indeed, defy anyone to show a better return for a business investment (for we look at it now in that light) than can be shown by the Church in the money invested in the life and energy of young men whom it has helped to educate for its work. We say this, not hastily, but deliberately. In fruitful return it is second to no work in which the Church can engage.

What does our government do in the way of self-protection against armed foes? What does the Military Adademy at West Point mean, and the Naval Academy at Annapolis? For what purpose have they been established if not to train men for the military and naval service of the government? And shall the children of the world be wiser in their day and generation than the children of light? Is not the Church engaged in a warfare with the powers of darkness, and shall she not train men for her service? If we were a nation of conquest we would pay still more attention to the education of military leaders. Fortunately we are not. The Church, however, has in charge a warfare, not simply defensive, but aggressive, intensely aggressive, with orders to go on from conquering to conquer, until the whole world is at the feet of Jesus Christ. Shall not the Church, then, train men to officer this army? It would be necessary to do so for self-protection—much more is it necessary when the war is to be carried everywhere into the enemy's country.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

But this good work of aiding men in preparing for the ministry has not escaped opposition. Great and necessary as it is, it has met with criticism and objections. Like other good causes, it must fight its way. There are men, professing Christian men, who find fault with missions, home and foreign, with

church extension, with God's providential dealings, with the Bible, even with God himself. Fault-finders are everywhere, and we meet them in the work of ministerial education. With some of these objectors we have a fair degree of patience; with others none at all. Some are sincere and honest and their objections are real difficulties with them, but others offer nothing but carping criticism. They have either not examined the subject with any care or have trumped up some excuse for not contributing to the cause.

1. The first objector we meet makes a dash at the whole system. He doesn't believe in it. He hasn't thought enough about it to specify his objections; *he is simply opposed to it.* If you ask him to suggest something better, he cannot do it. He is like the infidel that made a savage tirade against the Christian religion. After his fierce onslaught, a Quaker quietly arose and said: "Friend, if thee has found the Christian religion so bad, will thee suggest a better one in its place?" The blatant fellow was silenced. All that our objector can say is, "Let the young candidates for the ministry pay their own way, just as those for law and medicine do." It should be sufficient to tell him, that then there would not be enough, as experience has shown, to make up for the death losses, and the ranks of the ministry would become more and more depleted year by year. But that would likely not worry him. The progress of Zion is not a subject that over-burdens his heart. It causes no loss of sleep to him. He is a direct descendant of those in the Old Testament who are spoken of as "at ease in Zion." He is satisfied that the Gospel chariot shall roll along, but he prefers a comfortable seat inside to putting his shoulder to the wheel and helping it to roll.

When our objector speaks of law and medical students paying their way, he seems to lose sight of the fact that the prospective income from these professions is ordinarily enough to justify the young men in borrowing money to pay for their education. With the candidate for the ministry it is different. His salary will never be much more than will give him a bare living, and in many cases it is not enough for that. If he is to borrow, it must be in some way that will not require a return in money.

The Church has provided such a way. It says to the young man, in whom it finds the proper qualifications: "I will loan you money on this condition, that you pledge yourself for life to the service of the Master in proclaiming his Gospel and advancing his kingdom." It is a matter of business; but the method has this exceptional merit, that, exacting as the condition is, and profitable as it is to the lender, it suits the borrower better than any other. The lender requires more than any other one would, and yet it is just what the borrower is most willing to give. Ordinarily what is most profitable to the lender is proportionately to the disadvantage of the borrower, but not so here. The transaction is just what suits both and is to the highest advantage of each. There is a perverted way of looking at it, only too common, that makes it offensive and humiliating to the borrower; that is, when the money loaned is regarded as a benefaction, an act of charity, to the recipient.* It is a favor, but a favor for which an ample return is given. If a man loans me money on certain conditions, and I meet those conditions, he has favored me but he has not done me an act of charity.

---

*Rev. Charles E. Hay, of Allentown, Pa., in the QUARTERLY for Jan. 1885, on "The Influence of Beneficiary Education upon the Character of the Ministry" says, p. 95:

"But will any honorable young man accept such charity? it may be asked. Charity forsooth! Pray what is charity? Is the farmer charitable when he feeds the ox that treads out his grain? Is the merchant charitable when he pays his book-keeper? It is not compassion, but self-interest, which here appeals to the Church of Christ. She sets up, or rather finds set before her in God's word, a lofty ideal. For its attainment she needs direction. She must have leaders, teachers, overseers. These are a composite result of rare native endowment, and educational equipment. The native endowment God has given freely. The Church pays a few dollars toward the educational equipment, and then receives her reward in a life-time of consecrated service. If we must talk of charity here, let us not forget the devotion of means and strength without reserve, the abundant labors of a life, with the prospect of an old age unpensioned and unpitied, with possibly a family unprovided for. But such considerations are on either side unworthy. It is not kindly feeling for needy applicants upon the one hand, nor selfish desire for her own advancement upon the other, that should sustain such enterprise in the Church, but *an overpowering desire* for the progress of the kingdom of Christ. The candidate gives his *all* to the work, counting it but little and himself an unprofitable ser-

I don't like the term "beneficiary," as applied to a young man who receives money from the Church in preparing for the ministry. I have purposely not used it in speaking on this subject. It has helped as much as anything else to give a perverted view of the whole work. In New England they call him a "charity student" which is still worse. Such terms, uttered, as they usually are, with a sneering tone, have kept many a sensitive young man out of the ministry, who would have been a power for good, if he had entered it.

2. This suggests another objection we sometimes hear, namely, that receiving aid from the Church, for the purpose of being educated for the ministry, makes the recipient *unmanly*, that it pauperizes him, and takes from him that spirit of independence which he ought to have. How is this? Is this the effect on others who are similarly aided? How is it with men who are graduated at West Point? Have not some of them been the manliest men of our country? And yet they were aided—not simply aided but supported—not simply supported as to their school-expenses but clothed also—not simply the needy supported, but all irrespective of their wealth or poverty. The United States government regards them as in its service from the day they enter the Academy as students and provides for their full support. It does not ask whether the cadet needs assistance or not, but meets all his expenses, whether a poor boy without a dollar or a rich one with his tens of thousands. And yet no one considers it unmanly for him to accept this support, and he himself does not feel humiliated in receiving it. On the other hand he considers it an honor to be appointed a cadet, and we feel like congratulating him. Why should it be otherwise with the Church cadets? The generous treatment of the government does not generate an unmanly spirit in the young men it educates; then why should the aid given by the Church have that effect?

---

vant. The Church sustains him, counting it high privilege to do so in order that through him may be made known within her bounds and abroad throughout the earth the unsearchable riches of Christ. There is here no suppliant and patron, but mutual co-operation in a great work—members of one body moving together for one end.

More than this. If this result follows receiving aid while being educated, it is not confined to students for the ministry, but affects, in some degree, a large proportion of men in all professions and callings requiring a collegiate education. Nearly all our colleges are more or less fully endowed, and the proceeds from the endowment are used to supplement the receipts from tuition in order to pay expenses. And what does this mean? Simply this: No student in one of these colleges, be he rich or poor, pays for all he gets. Instead of paying $150 tuition a year, the endowment relieves him of $100, and he is asked to pay only $50. The endowment is contributed by men who are everywhere regarded as *benefactors*, and yet all the students reap the fruits of these *benefactions* without feeling that it is unmanly and without any conscious loss of self-respect. Why then should the student having the ministry in view feel the loss of self-respect, or that he is doing an unmanly thing, in receiving aid during his preparation, especially when he pledges himself to make a return in service—a pledge the others do not give?

Furthermore, an all-sufficient refutation to this objection is the outcome of the system. Take any body of ministers, as they are assembled in our synods, and select, *if you can*, a more manly and self-respecting set of men than the very ones that, with slim or empty purses of their own, received aid from the purse of the Church while being educated for its service. It cannot be done. In true manliness and self-respect all of them can stand side by side with their self-supported brethren.

3. Another objection we hear is, that *unfit men* are sometimes received on the funds, who, after a few years, discontinue their studies and turn to something else, or are dismissed perhaps for some misdemeanor. Yes, there is no doubt but that this is sometimes the case. We can cite instances of it ourselves. But this is no fault of the system, but rather of depraved human nature and the fallible judgment of men in dealing with it. Education committees cannot read the hearts of men, and errors of judgment are likely to occur. These errors of judgment, too, while they allow some unfit men to creep in, are just as likely to keep some good ones out. But to do away with the whole

work because such mistakes occur is illogical and foolish. Will you do away with the gospel ministry because some unworthy men in it bring disgrace upon it? Will you do away with the Church because there are some unworthy members in it? Satan was once an angel in heaven. Our blessed Lord had a Judas among his twelve apostles. The Church has been forewarned that there will be tares with the wheat. In the days of primitive Christianity there was an Ananias, a Simon Magus, a Demas, and a Diotrephes. These things must be expected in spite of all precautions, as long as human nature is what it is. If you look for the angel wings to show themselves very prominently on men, you are likely to be disappointed.

And, after all, my objecting friend, is not this a mere excuse to cover up your indisposition to reach into your pocket and draw out the shining dollars. Come now, be honest about it; don't you also raise objections even against missions, and all because you are somewhat stingy. You say you don't believe in helping to educate young men for the ministry because some of them turn out worthless. Do you not fear that some one will say he does not believe in the Church because, with you for an example, it fails to make men liberal?

4. Sometimes we hear it said that the men who have been aided are not as efficient and faithful as those who have supported themselves. Is this true? Let us see. In the *Princeton Review* for July, 1883, Prof Patton, in an article on the "Education of Ministers," has a tabulated statement of the Princeton students bearing on the relative efficiency and fidelity of the aided and self-supported. (See table at the bottom of the page.) He takes a period of 25 years—from 1849 to 1874—the total number of theological students being 1355, of whom 961, or more than two-thirds, received aid, and 394 were self-

Occupations, &c.	Number.		Per Cent.	
	Aided.	Self-Supporting.	Aided.	Self-Supporting.
Missionaries	64	20	6.6	5.1
Secretaries, Editors, Agents of Benevolent Societies	16	10	1.5	2.5
Presidents, Professors, &c.	62	26	6.4	6.6
In Charge of Churches,	652	198	67.8	50.1
Died before Ordination	19	7	1.9	1.7
In Secular Employments	33	48	3.4	12.1
Without Charge, or occupation unknown in 1881	115	85	11.9	21.5

supporting. We confine ourselves to the percentages as showing the comparison more clearly than by giving the exact numbers of each class. His showing is as follows: Missionaries, 6.6 per cent. of the aided, 5.1 per cent. of the self-supported. In charge of churches, 67.8 per cent. of the aided, 50.1 per cent. of the self-supported. Secretaries, Editors, Agents of Benevolent Societies, 1.5 per cent. of the aided, 2.5 per cent. of the self-supported. Presidents, Professors, &c., 6.4 per cent. of the aided, 6.6 per cent of the self-supported. In secular employments, 3.4 per cent. of the aided, 12.1 per cent. of the self-supported. Without charge, or their occupation unknown, 11.9 per cent. of the aided, 21.5 per cent of the self-supported. What a favorable showing this is as to the usefulness and ability and fidelity of the aided students. You will notice that those who have been aided are ahead in the percentage of missionaries, of those who have charge of churches, about equal as to Presidents of Colleges, Professors, &c., but the self-supported have a higher percentage among Secretaries, Editors, &c., in secular employments nearly 4 to 1, and without charge or occuption unknown 2 to 1. Dr. Patton says: "The emphatic fact of the statement is, that 33.6 per cent. of the self-supported students were * * in secular employments and without charge, as their occupation was unknown." The percentage of those who were aided is less than half of this.

"A statement covering for a like period the occupations of the Andover students (Congregational) presents practically the same results as the Princeton statement. * * For the years 1849 to 1873, 72.4 per cent. of the aided students were in charge of churches as against 55.9 per cent. of the self-supported."

We have no data for a like statement as to the students of our Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, but we feel no hesitation in venturing the prediction that the results would be similar to those of Princeton and Andover.

The truth is, that, like in medicine and law, and any other calling indeed, so in the ministry may be found all degrees of comparison—the good, better, best, and bad, worse, worst—but it is an encouraging fact that those who are aided make such an

excellent record among the good, better, best. It shows how well it is to use the Church's money for this purpose.

Dr. Alexander Young, of Allegheny, Pa., in a paper read before the Third Presbyterian General Council, held in Belfast in 1884, says in *italics:* "Nor is *aid to godly young men preparing for the ministry a matter of doubtful utility.* With all the aid granted, the increase of the ministry is far below the growth of the Church, and still farther below its wants. There is no room for the cry, 'Fewer and better.' We need to emphasize the cry, 'Far more and far better;' and to secure this we must aid young men more liberally."

5. Just here a word will not be out of place as to the objection that too much money is appropriated to each student. While all his expenses, with the practice of economy and the purchase of only such books and clothing as he needs, are from $250 to $300, the appropriation seldoms exceeds $150 or $200 and is in many cases less. The difference must be supplied by friends or made up through the young man's own efforts. It is generally met in the latter way. Here is ample opportunity for him to develop his self-reliance, or "back-bone," as some choose to call it. He often does it, too, at the expense of his studies and his health. There are few lines of remunerative employment open to students, and a vacation of ten or twelve weeks could be used more profitably in some kind of work closely allied with the ministerial than in any other. This spine-strengthening process is sometimes carried too far, and there is a break instead of additional strength. Then again, a young man cannot study with much comfort or with much success while haunted by the spectre of increasing debt, with an empty pocket-book. He is in no condition for vigorous intellectual exertion. Lofty thoughts and noble conceptions are crowded out by harassing anxieties as to the wherewithal to meet expenses. He could do better if he could jingle a little extra silver while at work. An illustration of this is the old clergyman who would borrow a ten-dollar gold piece every Saturday and return it the following Monday, because, as he said, he could always preach better with a little gold in his pocket.

But some seem to find great virtue in putting a young student

on half allowance or nothing at all. "It is just the way to make a man of him," they say. If this is true, it seems very strange that the practical application of the principle is so closely limited to young men studying for the ministry. Why should not wealthy parents put their sons on a level with the poorest of their associates if this process is so beneficial? If they need three or four hundred dollars a year, why not refuse to give more than half or third of the amount, or nothing at all. But is such a course necessary? There are difficulties enough in the pathway of most lives. We need not go out of our way to find more. And the young man, from the day he enters his name as a student for the ministry till the day he is called from the pulpit to his reward on high, will find enough of trials and vexations to prove a very furnace to him, without being subjected unnecessarily to hardships while preparing for his life-work in the College and Seminary.

CONCLUSION.

But enough. We shall use no more time in answering objections—many of them utterly unworthy of earnest Christian men. Let us rather address ourselves to the grave importance of the situation. The world is the field in which the harvest is growing, wide in extent, priceless in value, ripe for the sickle, and ready to perish. The laborers have always been few and much of it has perished. The laborers still are few and much of it is now perishing. The cry for more men comes from all denominations. Dr. Herrick Johnson, in his sermon as Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, a few years ago, said: "We are threatened with a famine of the ministry. * * We are making less ministers than we made ten years ago." A writer in the *Atlantic Monthly* on "The Decline of Congregationalism" shows that, while the population of the United States has increased 33 per cent. in a certain number of years, the membership of the Congregational Church has increased only 23 per cent., and the increase in the number of ministers shows a still smaller percentage. The Episcopalian Church is also stirred up on the question, as the following clipping from a newspaper will show:

"The editor of the *Church Review* is authorized by a prominent layman deeply interested in the subject to offer a first and second prize of $250 and $100 respectively for the best and second best of a series of articles to be written for the purpose of showing the value and importance of Beneficiary Aid Societies for the education of young men for the ministry of the Church —the duty on the part of the laity generously to sustain such societies, and effectually answering the objections commonly urged against beneficiary education."

And so we might go on with other denominations. With the Lutheran Church, especially the General Synod, the subject of increasing the ministry is more pressing than with any other. Would that parents who are able to educate their sons would consecrate them to this noble work! But few of them do it. Worse still: when a wealthy young man is prompted to prepare for this sacred calling, the parents and brothers and sisters, although professing Christians, often hoot at such a purpose and discourage him. Study law, or medicine, or go into business, anything but the ministry. What is the Church to do, in fulfillment of its great commission, but to select worthy young men of limited means, and give them the necessary aid? Yes, select them, not wait for them to offer themselves. Pastors are in a specially good position for doing this. Let them, as soon as they find a young man of suitable qualifications, present to him this subject of preparing for the ministry. Let the proper qualifications consist of piety with a sound mind in a sound body—heart, brain and health all right—and then urge the duty of preparing to preach. There surely should be an average of one for each pastor. If one of our large Synods has 14 young men whom it aids, we are apt to think that is doing well. But what does that mean? Taking seven years for the college and seminary courses, it means an addition of only two per annum to our ordained ministers. Few of our Synods are doing as well as this; some of them not half as well; some of them nothing at all. What of the future at this rate? Is it not time for us to take a new departure in this work? Who will man our missions after awhile? Who will occupy the pulpits we have? Who will go into new fields?

"Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. But how shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach except they be sent?"

ARTICLE V.

RECENT EDUCATIONAL MOVEMENTS IN THEIR RELATION TO LANGUAGE STUDY.

By Prof. F. V. N. Painter, A. M., Roanoke College, Salem, Va.

Under every great political, social, religious, and educational movement there are found certain truths or principles that act as motive power. The movement may be very complex and varied in its manifestations, but the underlying truths or principles are generally clear and simple. The Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century, for example, with all the civil and ecclesiastical disturbances it brought about, was based on these two well-known principles: 1. Men are saved by faith alone; and, 2. The Bible is the only rule of faith and practice in religion. The American Revolution, with all its multiplicity of events, was founded on the principle that taxation without representation is tyranny. Illustrations might be multiplied indefinitely; but the truth is evident that great movements in society generally derive their impulse from one or more principles which admit of perspicuous statement.

The principles or truths that originate a general movement are welcomed and sustained by growing numbers of people. The judgment of the masses, when they are unbiased by passion or selfishness, is usually sound. The proverb *vox populi, vox Dei* is not always delusive. When the principles that appeal for popular support are erroneous, or when they affect no important interest of society, they will be received with but little favor. The zeal of agitators will be lost upon the intelligent inertia of society. It is only when the new principles advanced are believed to be true and conducive to the best interests of

society that they gain adherents and ultimately conquer ascendency. The victory may be long deferred; but if the principles underlying the movement are just, they will triumph in the end. When the agitation was once begun, the abolition of slavery was inevitable; for the anti-slavery movement represented just views of human freedom. If the principles underlying recent educational movements are correct, we may confidently expect them to prevail.

That a great movement has been going on for some years in the educational world admits of no reasonable doubt. The present is justly regarded by many as a period of transition. First of all, there is an unexampled interest in education. Learning is no longer confined to any class; on the contrary, all Christian nations, and even some heathen nations, are making strong efforts to increase their facilities for popular instruction. The subjects of study have been largely increased in schools of every grade. In our colleges and universities the subjects of instruction have been so multiplied that it has become necessary to arrange parallel and elective courses. The mother tongue, modern languages, natural sciences, history and civics have won at least partial recognition. The harsh and mechanical methods of a few decades ago have been largely supplanted by scientific methods. Pupils do not exist for teachers, but teachers for pupils. It is thus seen that the educational movement of the present embraces a number of particulars; but in general it may be said to exhibit a single practical tendency; that is to say, it aims at such a training of the young as will fit them for life in the latter part of the nineteenth century.

The way for recent educational changes has been in process of preparation for a long time. Not simply one, but many preachers in the wilderness have proclaimed the evils existing in the education of their day. Some of them, with prophetic eye, saw and foretold the advent of a better era. Montaigne, who held that the mother tongue and the languages of neighboring countries should be first learned, said: "No doubt Latin and Greek are very great ornaments, and of very great use; but we may buy them too dear." Bacon, to whom the

modern world is indebted beyond measure, threw off the tyranny which the ancients had so long exercised over human thought, and attained to an independence of judgment that enabled him to appreciate the treasures of the modern world. "It would indeed be dishonorable to mankind," he says, "if the regions of the natural globe, the earth, the sea, the stars, should be so prodigiously developed and illustrated in our age, and yet the boundaries of the intellectual globe should be confined to the narrow discoveries of the ancients." Milton, who has treated of education with a fearless and masterly hand, declares that "a complete and generous education is that which fits a man to perform justly, skillfully and magnanimously all the offices, both private and public, of peace and war." He condemns severely the "pure trifling at grammar and sophistry" which characterized the schools of his day. Comenius, the greatest educator of the seventeenth century, condemned the schools of his time, and pointed out with surprising acuteness and truth the path of reform. "Hitherto," he says, "the schools have not labored that the children might unfold like the young tree from the impulse of its own roots, but have been contented when they covered themselves with foreign branches. They have taught the youth, after the manner of Æsop's crow, to adorn themselves with strange feathers. Why shall we not, instead of dead books, open the living book of nature? Not the shadows of things, but the things themselves, which make an impression on the senses and the imagination, are to be brought before youth. By actual observation, not by a verbal description of things, must instruction begin." Locke maintained that French should precede Latin, and that English should receive more attention than either. "This I think will be agreed to," he says, "that if a gentleman is to study any language it ought to be that of his own country, that he may understand the language which he has constant use of with utmost accuracy." These are some of the mighty voices that were raised against wrong subjects and methods—but voices that were hushed before the light of the new day blessed the earth.

As a rule the principles characterizing a great movement are

the result of a process of development. Men are so influenced by environment, are so controlled by traditional ideas and prevailing customs, that they cannot at once rise to a clear and full appreciation of newly-discovered truth. Many years elapsed, for example, before the Copernican system was generally adopted. The injustice of England continued a long time before the colonists were able to attain to the principles of human liberty set forth in the Declaration of Independence. The principles of education that supply impulse to current educational movements are no exception to the general law of growth. Beginning with Montaigne Bacon, and Comenius, a long line of educational reformers made contributions to the store of pedagogic truth. Finally, through the genius and self-denying labors of Pestalozzi, the most influential school-master of the present century, this body of truth was further developed, somewhat systematized, exemplified in practice, and brought to the attention of educators throughout Christendom. The principles, on which the progressive educational movements of the present are based, did not reach a tolerably complete scientific statement for more than two hundred years. It is only within the last decade or two that they have gained extensive recognition.

The science of education that is giving impulse and power to present educational movements and reforms is essentially Baconian. It is based on a careful study of man's nature. It assumes as a fundamental truth that the principles of education are to be derived from a study of the being to be educated. In its essential nature education is regarded as a development of the physical, mental, and moral powers of the student. An impulse toward development is inherent in the various faculties of man. The function of the teacher is to direct and facilitate this natural growth, that each student may realize the best he is capable of. Pestalozzi has well said: "Sound education stands before me symbolized by a tree planted near fertilizing waters. A little seed, which contains the design of the tree, its form and proportions, is placed in the soil. See how it germinates and expands into trunk, branches, leaves, flowers, and fruit! The whole tree is an uninterrupted chain of organic parts, the plan of which existed in its seed and root. Man is similar to the tree.

In the new-born child are hidden those faculties which are to unfold during life. The individual and separate organs of his being form themselves gradually into an harmonic whole, and build up humanity in the image of God." But education has another side that must not be disregarded. The being to be educated is destined to share in the world's activity. Various duties pertaining to his vocation, to the state, the church, society, and the family, are to devolve upon him. The culture he receives should bear a just relation to the duties of practical life. The young should be educated for useful and righteous living in the world into which they have been born. This is Milton's view as expressed in a sentence already quoted. Comenius held that nothing should be taught that is not of practical utility. Herbert Spencer has declared with great force and justice that "To prepare us for complete living is the function which education has to discharge; and the only rational mode of judging of any educational course is to judge in what degree it discharges such function."

In intellectual education we must begin with the senses. These are the avenues to the mind; and it is through them that the intellect is to be excited into activity and the foundation of all knowledge laid. The law of intellectual growth is exercise. There is little educating power in what the student receives passively. His interest must be awakened; his faculties must be active in grasping objects and truths; and whatever he studies must be kept within his powers of comprehension and assimilation. During the first years of the pupils progress, the concrete should precede the abstract in study; ideas should go before, or along with the words representing them; examples and operations should precede rules and principles. It is only after the pupil has reached a stage of considerable development that this order of instruction can properly be reversed. At no time should the studies pursued be of a nature to destroy mental elasticity—the condition most favorable to rapid development. Instruction should begin with what lies nearest the student, and thus appeals to his interest and wants. In this particular Nature points us to the right path. The child begins by gaining a knowledge of its surroundings in the house; then it explores

the unknown regions of the flower yard and neighboring fields; as its strength increases, it learns the names and properties of the objects with which it has to deal. Beginning thus with what is near, our knowledge should go on in creasing by ever-widening circles till we compass the remotest truth. As a rule, what the pupil learns should connect itself naturally with what he already knows. The educators are wrong who at any point in the pupil's progress suddenly transplant him in a region where every thing is foreign to his nature.

We are now prepared to state and appreciate two of the fundamental principles underlying the aducational movements of the present—principles that are active in changing subjects and methods:

1. Education consists in developing the physical, mental, and moral powers of man in such a way that he can act his part to the best advantage in the world.

2. The law of this development is the student's own activity in learning facts, truths, and principles pertaining to nature society, and God.

The adoption of these principles with all that they involve has been greatly favored by existing circumstances. The increasing prominence achieved by the masses since the American and French Revolution, or to carry the principle back to its source, the growing appreciation of the worth of individual men as taught in the Gospels, goes far toward accounting for the general spread of education. International relations are growing closer every year, and already poets are beginning to dream of a federation of mankind. The vast enlargement of the field of knowledge—an enlargement that has rendered the old curriculum narrow and inadequate—explains the increased number of studies. A better understanding of the physical, intellectual, and moral nature of man has led to an abolition of the cruel methods in vogue a hundred years ago, and has demonstrated the truth that no two or three studies have a monopoly of educating power. In a word, the world has out grown the swaddling clothes that were wrapped around it in the seventeenth century. The whole educational movement of the present is, in

its essential features, a protest against a narrowness from which the world has suffered too long.

It is a matter of regret that general reformatory movements are usually attended with objectionable manifestations. While it is a mistake to say, as Carlyle has done in a cynical moment, that the people of a country are "mostly fools," we have everywhere one-sided men who as enthusiasts advocate extreme views. In the Reformation, a movement so rich in historical illustration, there arose by the side of the reformers a body of fanatics who sought to turn their newly-won liberty into license, and to overthrow the existing order of society. These enthusiasts are a hindrance to the cause that they seek to advance. It is greatly to be regretted that recent educational reforms have been retarded by the inconsiderate and often radical measures of one-sided and superficial men. It is through their unfortunate influence that the name "New Education," which would be so convenient to characterize the educational tendencies of the present day, has been robbed of its honorable significance. Education has needed, not sweeping radical changes, but a natural expansion and improvement in order to adjust it to existing conditions.

Returning to an application of the two principles laid down above, we find that they relate to the study of natural science, history, and civics, no less than to the study of language; but it is in reference to the languages that their influence will now be briefly traced.

1. These principles require that a greater emphasis be placed on the utility of languages for practical life. To study a language, whether ancient or modern, for disciplinary purposes alone is not the wisest use of time; for discipline can be secured by other studies which offer the additional advantage of being serviceable in after life. Besides, a study pursued only for discipline is apt to lack that interest which calls the student's powers into the most healthful activity. The mental effort that is the result of compulsion and against which the student's feelings constantly protest, tends to rob the mind of its elasticity, blunts its perceptions, and weakens its creative power.

2. These principles are unfavorable to the old theory that

grammatical drudgery is the best mental discipline. The gymnastic theory is only partly true. Education is not a mechanical leading forth of the various powers, as it is too often conceived to be. The etymology of the word education—*e*, out, and *ducere*, to lead—has often been grossly misunderstood. Education is a development that is secured by activity in assimilating truth suited to the mind's condition and wants. Languages should be studied in order to be mastered, with the ultimate view of acquiring their treasures of thought. Other ends in language study are entirely secondary. To study a language simply as a mental gymnastic, to hold the student for years in what Milton calls "the flats and shallows" of language, is an educational mistake. Neither a grammarian nor a philologian represents the highest type of culture. Though the world has been slow in realizing it, Milton was right in saying "that language is but the instrument conveying to us things useful to be known. And though a linguist should pride himself to have all the tongues that Babel cleft the world into, yet if he have not studied the solid things in them, as well as the words and lexicons, he were nothing so much to be esteemed a learned man as any yoeman or tradesman competently wise in his mother dialect only."

3. These principles supply us with a new standard in judging of the results of education. A perfect man is the ideal aimed at. Physical, mental, and moral culture—the ability to judge correctly and to act wisely in the present—this is the object to be sought. The pale scholar with stooped shoulders who lives in an idealized past, who thinks more about Jupiter than about Jehovah, who can talk learnedly about Greece and knows nothing about Germany, who can explain the causes of the Peloponesian war but not of the Franco-Prussian struggle—such a man may be interesting and useful, but he does not represent the culture demanded at the present day, especially in this country. The educated man needed to-day is one that makes his knowledge of the past subservient to the present, and finds his highest intellectual efforts and pleasures in the age to which he belongs. A man should not make himself an anachronism.

4. These principles encourage the practice of presenting to

the student what is best in human thought. The ancients are estimated at their true worth; but no self-delusion or unintelligent enthusiasm is allowed to attribute to them imaginary excellencies of thought and style. They belong to the youth of the world; and the best results of human thinking, whether in philosophy, politics, morality, or religion, is not embodied in their writings. Whatever they have produced worthy of remembrance, whatever conduces to the great end of education, is retained; but the student is directed to the results of modern thought and investigation for what is to equip him for his place in the world. There is scarcely a department of thought, excepting perhaps oratory and poetry, in which the ancients have not been superseded. To cite but a single instance, was not Macaulay right, with Gibbon's great work before him, to characterize the history by Herodotus as "delightful childishness?" While the ancient classics, as the original sources of much of modern culture, are not to be neglected; while every comprehensive scheme of education must embrace them, whether in the original languages or in good translations, they are not to be exalted, either by the force of tradition or the blindness of prejudice, into an undue pre-eminence. Our highest studies must be in the more fully developed thought of the present day.

Such is believed to be the trend of the educational world, together with that which gives its movement force. Along with the natural sciences, history, civics, and the mother tongue, the modern languages, especially French and German, have acquired greater prominence. This prominence is destined to increase, as international relations become more intimate, and as these languages embody from year to year the best achievements of human effort. As mankind progresses from age to age, it is naturally led to reshape education to suit its needs.

ARTICLE VI.

ESCHATOLOGY AS TAUGHT BY OUR LORD.

By D. C. MARQUIS, D. D., McCormick Theol. Seminary, Chicago, Ill.

The Eschatological discourses of Jesus, as recorded in the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth chapters of the Gospel by Matthew, and in the twenty-first chapter of the Gospel by Luke, have long been a source of perplexity and difficulty to the interpreters of Scripture.

The difficulty appears to be two-fold.

1st. To bring the two records of Matthew and Luke in harmony with each other.

2nd. To so interpret the record of Matthew as that it shall be in harmony with itself.

The common interpretation supposes that Matt. 24 and Luke 21 are two reports of one and the same discourse, delivered to the same audience at the same time. There is indeed a marked similarity between the two, amounting to almost complete identity in certain paragraphs. *E. g.*, Luke 21 : 8–11 is almost identical with Math. 24 : 4–7. Again Luke 21 : 29-33 is nearly identical with Math. 24 : 32–35. But here the identity ends, and features of marked contrast appear.

1. Luke 21 : 12, goes back and predicts a history that shall precede the events which have just been foretold, *προ δέ τουτων απαντων*; whereas Matthew 24 : 8 goes forward and predicts a history that shall follow the events just predicted; *παντα δε ταυτα αρχη ωδινων.*

2. Luke's record makes no mention of the "end of the age," except to affirm (v. 9) that it does not immediately follow the earlier *commotions of the world.*

He does speak (v. 28) of a redemption of the church which is to be consummated in the beginning of a final tribulation. He also records (v. 36) an exhortation to watchfulness and prayer, on the part of the Church that they may be counted worthy to escape this period of trial and to stand before the Son

of man. Matthew, however, (24 : 14) speaks of the τελος as about to follow "then," τοτε, upon the universal proclamation of the gospel of the kingdom. He also describes (24 : 29–31) the wreck of nature and the glorious appearing of the Son of man, as about to follow "*immediately*" ευθεως upon a period of trial just described.

3. Luke 21 : 24 pictures the destruction of Jerusalem and its subjection to Gentile sway as continuing until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled. Math. 24 : 15–29 pictures an awful woe upon Judea and a shortened period of unparalleled severity to be followed immediately by the end.

4. Luke 21 : 20 gives the sign for the faithful to escape from Jerusalem to be the beginning of a military siege. Math. 24 : 15 gives the sign of departure from Judea to be the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place.

To harmonize these incongruities on the common idea that these are two reports of the same discourse delivered to the same audience at the same time is to my own mind simply impossible. One of the best proofs of its impossibility is the unsatisfactory result of all attempts to work out a consistent interpretation on that line. No commentator whom I have consulted, has succeeded to his own satisfaction, much less to the satisfaction of his readers.

Reconciliation seems equally impossible, too, if we suppose that the passages wherein these incongruities occur refer to the same event, or to the same period of human history, *e. g.* when Luke's record makes the woe of Jerusalem to be followed by its subjection to Gentile domination until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled, that is one thing. But when Matthew's record makes *the woe of Judea* and its unequaled tribulation to be followed immediately by the wreck of nature and the coming of the Son of Man, that is another and quite a different thing. It is impossible upon any fair principle of interpretation to refer these two woes to the same period of the world's history.

The commentators who have proceeded upon the supposition that the woe of Judea described in Matthew is identical with the woe of Jerusalem described in Luke and that both were fulfilled

in A. D. 70, have ventured upon various solutions of the difficult problem. *E. g.* one (Morison in loc.) finds a transition from the woe of Judea, to the scenes of the last times, in the τοτε of v. 23. He makes τοτε equivalent to επειτα and translates it "afterward." Thus, by making τοτε cover the whole of the period between A. D. 70 and the last times, he prepares the way for ευθεως of v. 29. But this is certainly an unwarrantable use of τοτε. In all the many places where the word is used in the N. T. it expresses either simultaneousness or immediate succession; never indefinite succession. Another (Owen) makes the entire passage even down to the close of v 31, to be but a figurative description of the scenes attending the capture of Jerusalem by the Romans, although the glorious appearing of the Son of Man is minutely described (vs. 29, 30, 31). Still others give to the predictions a double reference, (1) to Jerusalem as then existing and (2) to the scenes of the last days, but the attempt to distinguish the one from the other, or to find the double reference extending throughout the prophecy, only makes confusion worse confounded.

I see no reason why the two records (Math. 24, Luke 21) may not be understood as containing two separate discourses, the one overlapping and partially repeating the other. The discourse recorded by Luke may have been spoken either by the temple wall or on the way to Olivet. *It was in answer* to the question of the disciples, When shall these things be: and what sign when these things are about to take place—"these things," referring to the predicted destruction of the temple.

It begins with a description of the trials of the Church in its earlier days—trials arising from the pretensions of false Christs and from popular commotions—with an exhortation not to be deceived by these, for they are not the heralds of the immediate end of the age (Luke 21 : 8, 9).

Instead of these earlier trials, indicating the immediate end, he declares (vs. 10, 11) that the world's history shall be a story of wars, famines, earthquakes, pestilences, and at the last, terrors and great signs from heaven. In this brief paragraph (vs. 10, 11) we find a succinct history of the world during the present age. For what is history, but a story of wars—nation against nation

and kingdom against kingdom—earthquakes, pestilences, famines. The world's commotions, calamities, woes, have always been and are to day, the world's great epochs.

Having thus thrust the world's whole history into a nutshell, he turns back (v. 12) and describes more minutely the experience of the Church in connection with the nearer woes that are about to fall upon Jerusalem. "Before all these things," *i. e.* before the historic scenes just described—certain things will take place. Then follows (vs. 12–19) an account of the persecutions that should befall the disciples in their first antagonisms with unbelieving hate—a prediction which was accurately fulfilled in the history of the early Church. He tells them also of the destruction that would come upon Jerusalem and foretells the sign that would warn the disciples to make good their escape from the doomed city. "When ye see Jerusalem encircled by armies," &c. This prediction was literally fulfilled in the escape of the Christians to Pella at the time of the siege by the Roman forces under Titus. Then (vs. 22–24) he describes the awful destruction that would come upon the city and the scattering of the people among all nations, and the subjection of the holy city to Gentile domination "until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled."

In that brief sentence, "until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled," is covered *a vast period of human history.* It carries us forward by a single step to the closing scenes at the end of the age. He has reached now the very point indicated at the close of v. 11 from which he had turned back—with the words *προ δε τουτων απαντων*—to bring up the history more minutely.

Now, when "the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled" shall begin (v. 25) the opening scenes of a great tribulation, which is to proceed to the wreck of nature, and to end in the glorious appearing of the Son of Man (v. 27). But (*δε*, the Greek conjunctive, strongly adversative) the beginning of these awful scenes ought to be a time of rejoicing to the believing and waiting Church. When these things are beginning to be, then wake, lift your heads, for your redemption is near. This promise, with its accompanying exhortation points clearly and unmistakably to the separation of the believing Church from the world as described in 1 Thess. 4 : 16–18. This separation of the

Saints from the world, we are here told, shall take place at the beginning of the tribulation. While they are thus separate, in actual enjoyment of their completed redemption, the trial of the world shall go on, as it is here described (vs. 25, 26). There shall be signs in the sun, moon and stars, on the earth distress of nations with perplexity, the sea and the waves thereof roaring and men's hearts failing them for fear because of those things that are coming upon the inhabited earth. And all this commotion and confusion shall end in the final and glorious coming of the Lord; when Jude's quotation from Enoch shall be fulfilled, "when the Lord comes amid his holy myriads" to execute judgment. The beginning of the tribulation marks the time when the Lord will separate his people as foretold, 1 Thess. 4 : 16–18. Therefore he says when these things are beginning to be, lift your heads, for your redemption is near. The *end* of the tribulation marks the time when he will come with his holy myriads to execute judgment, as foretold in Jude 14, 15. A natural question just here would be, is there any sign by which we may know with certainty the beginning of the tribulation? As if anticipating this question Jesus proceeds (v. 29) to answer it. The sign is the same in kind as that by which we tell of the coming of summer. *When we see the budding leaves* we may expect the summer, though if we had no experience to guide us, we could predict nothing as to the time. Just so when we see these troubles, *γινομενα,* in existence, we may know that it heralds the near approach of the completed redemption, though, as we have no experience to guide us we can predicate nothing as to the time. But we may be sure of this, that when the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled, and the trials of the last days are begun, the redemption of the waiting Church is so near, as to fall within the limits of a single generation—*η γενεα ἀυτη*—this generation. The pronoun is demonstrative, not intensive. This is decided, not by the "breathing," (for that is no part of the inspiration) but by its position. If it were "the very generation," or "the same generation," it would read *η ἀυτη γενεα*. It must describe the generation *then* existing at the time contemplated in the view-point of the speaker. If it referred to a generation distant from the speaker's view-point, *εκεἰνη* would be

the pronoun employed. The only question then, is what is the view-point of the speaker? That is determined by v. 31. He is addressing you who see these things γινομενα, becoming. The divine prophet is standing in prophetic vision amid the scenes above described. He speaks to you, or you, or you, whoever may witness the beginning of these commotions, just as Paul said *We* who are alive, etc. To such he says: The wished for consummation will arrive before this generation shall pass away. The general truth taught is, the period intervening between the beginning of the tribulation of the last times, and the "consummation of the age" is very brief. The same generation that sees the sign, will also behold the consummation.

The lesson to the Church, in view of these disclosures, is not to let that day come upon it unawares. Uncertain as it must ever be as to when the final tribulation will begin, or as to which of earth's constantly recurring woes is the beginning of the final trial—the exhortation must be always timely to watch and pray that we may be accounted worthy to escape those things that shall come to pass. So watch against the excesses and the cares of this world, as that, when the Church's redemption is consummated, in the raising of the dead and the changing of the living, ye may be counted worthy of a place among the separated ones who shall escape the dire tribulation that has just begun; and be counted worthy to stand before the Son of Man; *i. e.* to be with him in secure separation from those awful calamities which the world must undergo immediately preceding its final judgment.

This ends the discourse as recorded by Luke. Before *passing to Matthew's record* it may be well to call to mind three well-known and generally accepted truths.

1. Luke's Gospel was written for the Gentile.

Therefore, if among the traditions of the Apostolic Church, or if among the written λογια of Jesus, there was found a discourse which portrayed the future of the Church during the times of the Gentiles—we might expect that the Holy Spirit would direct Luke to incorporate that discourse in his gospel.

2. The gospel by Matthew was written for the Jew.

Therefore, if, among the preserved λογια of Jesus a discourse

was found which gave prominence to the future of God's ancient people, as regards their relation to the Kingdom of Christ, we might expect the Holy Spirit to direct Matthew to incorporate that discourse in his gospel.

3. The Holy Scriptures, both in the Old Testament, and in the New, predict a future dealing of God with his ancient people of some marked and marvelous character.

The prophets are full of it. Paul, in the eleventh of Romans, reaffirms it. The Apocalypse foretells it. The past history and present status of the Hebrew people in the world, is a standing witness that some wonderful future is in store for the Hebrew nation.

Bearing with us these three truths, we turn now to the record of Matthew.

This discourse was delivered on the Mount of Olives, in response to the question of certain disciples, (Mark gives their names, Peter, James, John, Andrew, distinctive representatives of Judaistic ideas concerning the kingdom) who came to him privately and asked, "when shall these things be and what the sign of thy *παρουσια* and of the consummation of the age." The question contains two points which could not have been suggested by anything which appears in Matthew's record. The "*παρουσια*" and the "consummation of the age" could only have been suggested to them by their previous hearing of the discourse recorded by Luke.

In answering their question, Jesus begins with a repetition, almost word for word, of the opening sentences of the previous discourse. Math. 24 : 4–7. It is a brief description (vs. 4–6) of the near trials of the early Church with an assurance that these are not the end. Then follows (v. 7) an *epitome of the world's history*, nation against nation, kingdom against kingdom, famines, pestilences, earthquakes. Just as in the previous discourse, he condenses the world-history into a terse statement of the events which constitute the epochs of that history. So far the two discourses are identical.

But instead of *going back* as before, and portraying the experience of the Church from apostolic days down to the end of the age—he goes forward, beyond the times of the Gentiles,

and sketches the history of the Jewish people during the tribulation of the last times. "All these—all the experiences of the Church during the world-history just narrated—are a beginning of birth pangs." All that has preceded, during the times of the Gentiles, are as nothing compared with the sharper pains and sorer tribulations that are to come.

The prophecy from this point onward must presuppose at least a partial fulfillment of those ancient predictions concerning Israel which the prophets so often repeat, when there shall be a gathering of Israel in their own land, and this "gathering of Israel—Paul intimates (Rom. 11 : 26)—will be accompanied with a national profession of the faith of Christ.

In that condition this prediction of Jesus contemplates Israel, and foretells something of the trials that will then befall his covenant people.

(1). The nations of the earth will then be roused against them with a peculiar and deadly enmity, because of their profession of the name of Christ.

(2). There shall be defections and betrayals among themselves.

(3). False prophets shall arise and shall deceive many.

(4). The intensified hostility without, together with the falsehood and treachery within will have a discouraging effect upon the professedly faithful.

(5). But whoever abides faithful through the trial—without defection or apostasy—shall be saved.

(6). And by their very faithfulness, they will testify this, the Gospel of the kingdom.

The thing to be heralded is the good news that the glorious Messianic Kingdom, which the prophets long ago foretold, and for which the fathers waited, is at hand. The same Gospel that John Baptist preached—the same that I preached (says Jesus), but which Israel has now rejected, and by that rejection the manifestation of the kingdom is postponed until the fulness of the Gentiles is brought in—that Gospel shall then be heralded in the whole inhabited world in the certainty of the kingdom's near approach—a witness to all the nations—and then (τοτε) the end will come. The sure sign of the approaching *end*, will be "the abomination of desolation, foretold by Daniel the prophet,

standing in the holy place." This is demanded by the connective particle *ουν*. "When, *therefore*, ye may see." The *ουν* connects this paragraph directly and indissolubly with the *τελος* which precedes. It points to the abomination of desolation as the unmistakable sign of the predicted end. Here again the interpreters who strive to locate this passage in A. D. 70, are widely at variance among themselves. Ebrard and Winsler make *ουν* to refer back to the first part of the disciple's question, which had reference to the destruction of the temple (v. 3). But that part of their question did not ask for a sign. It only asked "when shall these things be?" The sign is asked for in the second part of the question, and it was to be a sign of the "*παρουσία*," and of the "consummation of the age." So that if we grant to the particle a connection so distant, it is still a connection of the *sign* with the *end*. Seeing this difficulty Dorner regards *ουν* as "introducing an application of the eschatological *principles* enunciated in all the preceding verses"—though what those "principles" are, and what the "application" is, he does not clearly inform us. Morison understands *ουν* to point to an inference from all that precedes, and he finds the inference in v. 16, "therefore—flee to the mountains." These are but specimens of the many and varied attempts to dispose of the particle so as to locate the paragraph in A. D. 70. Yet the unbiased student of the Greek N. T. must regard every one of these suggestions as somewhat forced and unnatural. I do not think it either uncharitable or untrue to say, that the poor little *ουν* would never have been tossed about through *a range of thirteen verses*, like Noah's dove seeking in vain for a resting place, had it not been necessary to maintain a theory. The plain, simple, logical connection is with the *τελος* which immediately precedes. The "abomination of desolation is the unmistakable sign of the "end."

The "abomination of desolation" cannot therefore be descriptive of anything that occurred when Jerusalem was destroyed by the Romans. It must refer to what will take place in the restored Israel, after the times of the Gentiles. In the midst of hostility without, and treachery and apostasy within, the faithful are warned that a sign shall be given when the nation must be

deserted. That sign is "the abomination of desolation, foretold by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place."

Precisely who or what this is it would be unprofitable to conjecture. May it not, by fair interpretation, be identified with that man of lawlessness whom Paul describes as the final development of the world's wickedness? (2 Thess. 2) and whose *παρουσια* is the certain precursor of the *παρουσια* of the Son of Man? He is to set himself in the temple of God and proclaim that HE is God.

When He shall be seen standing in the holy place, then let the faithful separate themselves absolutely from all association or affiliation with their nation. Let them "stand not upon the order of their going, but go at once" (vs. 17, 18). For then the tribulation will deepen until it will reach a point of dire distress such as never has been, nor may be (vs. 19–21). It is suffering so intense and terrible that no flesh could endure it, if it were to continue long. But for the sake of the elect—(that remnant of Israel whom God hath chosen, whom John describes as the hundred and forty-four thousand sealed ones (Rev. 7 : 4–8)—the period of trial is mercifully shortened (v. 22).

"Then," *τοτε*, (as it is known to the believing ones that this intensity of trial is a predicted sign of the near approach of the Messiah King, it may be expected that the presence of the trial will bring out pretended messiahs) if any one say, "Behold here, or there is the Christ, believe it not" (v. 23). *False Christs will be abundant.* Some of them will be accompanied by supernatural powers and by wonderful tokens of a supernatural mission, so numerous and marvelous that even the very elect might be deceived, if such a thing were possible.

The ultimate developments of supernaturalism, the germs of which may be seen in spiritism, and mind cure, and faith cure, will then be rife and rampant.

But, no matter where they may concentrate their influence and attempt to rally their followers, heed them not. If they send forth their proclamations from the desert, go not out to join them. If it be whispered that Messiah is come and is waiting his opportunity in secret, believe it not. *For* the *παρουσια* of

judgment will be so open and universally visible that no one can be mistaken about it when it comes. It will be like the flash of lightning, visible from horizon to horizon, illumining all the earth. Just as the eagles light where the carrion putrefies, so judgment will fall where corruption is foul, and as corruption covers the earth, so the coming of the Son of Man to judgment will be everywhere visible (vs. 23–28).

But (δε strongly adversative) although the judgment παρουσια, when it comes, will be so manifest as to leave no excuse for deception by any of the pretended Messiahs, it will be accompanied by signs peculiarly its own.

"Immediately," ευθεως. This is a word with which the commentators have hopelessly wrestled. Morison says, "It has been a very rack of torture to such expositors as have lost their way," and he proceeds to verify his statement by losing his own way. Aug. Meyer says, "It may be observed generally that a whole host of strange and fanciful interpretations have been given here, in consequence of its having been assumed that Jesus could not possibly have intended to say that his second advent was to follow immediately upon the destruction of Jerusalem," (meaning of course the destruction of A. D. 70.) If this statement means anything, it must mean that Meyer would avoid a fanciful interpretation by assuming that Jesus could and did utter a false prediction. Others (Wetstein, E. J. Meyer-Owen) make the entire paragraph (vs. 29–31) to be but a poetic or figurative description of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. But the visible coming of the Son of Man, the mourning of all the tribes of earth, *the gathering of the elect* by the ministry of angels from earth and heaven, these things present a very bog of difficulties in which that line of interpretation becomes hopelessly mired. Others (Schott-Hammond) try to make ευθεως mean "suddenly" as if it were ταχεως but that is simply playing with words for a purpose. Nowhere else in the New Testament does ευθεως mean anything else than immediate succession. Others (Morison) find a transition from the Roman conquest of Jerusalem to the last times in the word τοτε of v. 23, translating "afterward" as though it were επειτα. But that is maintaining the integrity of ευθεως by falsifying τοτε,

robbing Peter to pay Paul. Even if this were allowable it would not help the matter, because the tribulation referred to in v. 29 was described in vs. 21 and 22; before ever τοτε appeared in the text at all, and τοτε is only spoken for the purpose of injecting a warning against the pretended Messiahs of those days. The plain common sense meaning of both ευθεως and τοτε can be retained, however, and the difficulties of the passage disappear, if we but accept the truth that "the tribulation of those days" is the tribulation of the last times, and that the abomination of desolation is a development of the last times.

After the tribulation of those days, the whole frame work of nature will be convulsed in the throes of dissolution (v. 29). The relations of the planets of the solar system will be violently disturbed. The very laws that bind material bodies to their orbits, and that hold them in relation with each other, will be loosed. The powers of the heavens will be shaken. Then will appear the sign of the Son of Man in the heaven (v. 30). The flashing of his glory, the blazing effulgence of that ineffable brightness which radiates from his glorified person, will flash over the heavens and illumine all the sky. Then all the tribes of the earth will mourn. The unbelieving world is roused at last, to greet the shining of the glory of the Lord, as it blazes out amid the convulsive throes of nature, with one universal wail of woe and despair. They shall see the Son of Man coming upon the clouds of heaven, with power and much glory. Behold he cometh with clouds and every eye shall see him, and such as pierced him, and all the tribes of the earth shall wail on account of him. (Rev. 1 : 7.)

Then (v. 31) the angels, *those swift messengers* of the providence of Christ, will gather his elect together from the four quarters of the earth and from the utmost limits of the heavens. The elect of God, those saved *through* the tribulation and those saved *from* it, who hailed their redemption as complete in its beginning; the one gathered from the four quarters of the earth, the other from limit to limit of the heavens where they have been with Christ during the heat of the trial standing before the Son of Man, (Luke 21 : 36) all of them together shall be gathered to the side of the King. This is the παρουσια of judgment.

Before proceeding to describe the judgment scene itself he turns aside at this point to repeat what he had previously said in the discourse recorded by Luke, and from what follows, it would seem that the immediate reference here, as well as there, is to the παρουσια of grace. Its sign is as the sprouting of the tree to the summer (v. 32). Its only sign is the beginning of the tribulation. From the time when the tribulation begins, until the gracious παρουσια that shall separate the believing Church from the unbelieving world will be a period so brief as to fall within the limits of a single generation, v. 34. (see page 92). But concerning that day and hour no man knoweth, *i. e.* the time of the completion of the redemption of his believing ones which is to come so soon after the beginning of the tribulation. It must always be uncertain which of earth's constantly recurring trials is the beginning of the final one. Therefore no man can know and it is useless for anybody to predict the time. The angels do not know it. It is a secret locked in the bosom of the divine Omniscience, and the event alone will declare it. But the world will not be expecting it when it comes. It will be just as it was in the days of Noah. Then the people kept on living their accustomed life, eating, drinking, marrying and giving in marriage until the flood overtook them. So will be the παρουσια of the Son of Man when his saints will be separated and his judgments will begin. Just when men are pursuing their accustomed life, planting, building, *buying*, *selling*, *talking politics* and building railroads, the παρουσια will be present and the day of the Lord will begin, (vs. 37–39.)

Then to illustrate still more forcibly, if possible, the absolute unexpectedness of the event, he pictures two men at work in the field. They are farmers pursuing their usual occupation. One of them is of the number of the Lord's redeemed and regenerate children. The other is a child of the world. Instantly, in the twinkling of an eye (1 Cor. 15 : 52), one is changed to the body of the resurrection and caught up to meet the Lord in the air. The other is left to share the world's tribulation and judgment. Two women are at work with a handmill. If he had said, baking bread or working sewing machines, or stitching

embroidery it would have the same meaning. It means anything in the line of every-day occupation. One is a follower of Jesus; the other is a woman of the world. Instantly, just in the midst of their conversation and work, one is changed into the bodily likeness of Christ, and taken with the risen saints to be with the Lord; the other is left to share the tribulation and judgment that are coming upon the world, (vs. 40, 41.)

As this is the future of the παρουσια that most concerns the Church, and as the time of it is absolutely unknown and imminent, it behooves the Church to watch, and to be always in an attitude of watchfulness. Δια τοῦτο (v. 44) be ye also ready, for just at the time when we think he is not coming, then is the very time when he will come. Our position is that of a steward whom an absent master has left in charge of a property. If we take courage in negligence by his delay and think to indulge our selfishness with impunity, the accounting will be unexpected and the penalty swift and terrible. We have proved our falsehood and unworthiness and the space for repentance has gone by, (vs. 45–51). Then (ch. 25 : 1–13) by the story of the ten virgins he illustrates the reception he will have from the Church at the time of the παρουσια of grace. In ch. 25 : 14–30, by the parable of the talents, he illustrates the principle on which awards will be distributed at the παρουσια of judgment. Then (vs. 25–31) he returns to the description of the judgment scene itself which had been interrupted at ch. 24 : 32. That is indeed *the end.* The only thing to follow is, the everlasting punishment, and the life eternal, (vs. 31–46)

There are four indispensable conditions of correct exegesis which must be constantly observed. 1. The meaning of words. 2. Grammatical construction. 3. Logical connection. 4. Analogical interpretation. I submit whether the interpretation herein outlined does not entirely satisfy the first three of these conditions. 1. The meaning of words is not strained. 2. Grammatical construction is not violated. 3. The logical connection is natural and consistent throughout.

Is the fourth condition also satisfied? That must depend upon whether the Scriptures teach a dual παρουσια (of grace

and of judgment) and a dual dispensation (of Gentile and Jew) as constituting the age.

It may be said that this attempt at exegesis lacks authority, as being outside of the current lines of interpretation. But if it has (as I believe) the authority of the divine word, that is sanction enough for there is none higher.

ARTICLE VII.

A PENNY A DAY.

By Rev. Prof. M. H. Richards, A. M., Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Penna.

If any will not work, neither shall he eat. But if any will work, what shall he eat? What work shall have white bread, and what shall have brown, and how much of either shall it be? That is the "labor problem," the great social question of our day and land. Not indeed exclusively and especially our problem, for it has always been the problem of all days and of all lands, along with its twin difficulty of finding suitable work for all, and of persuading or constraining all to work. But what appears of indifferent importance when distant assumes such intensely interesting aspects when the pronouns change from "them" and "theirs" to "us" and "ours," that one forgets the common lot in the personal instance, and treats the case accordingly.

Our problem is no mean one, viewed in relation to the numbers interested in a fair solution of it. The larger mass of mankind must inevitably be of those whose prayer for *daily* bread is a serious one and no religious sentimentalism. Excluding the truism that almost all men are workers in some sense of fair construction, and naming as the laborers only those usually so meant, think nevertheless how great that army is, and how many camp followers it has, consisting of wives and children, dependent parents or younger brothers and sisters. All these have much to hope or fear from the varying purchasing power of the "penny a day;" much to dread, if it fail altogether.

The problem is a right royal one in this respect also, that, like Pharoah's dream, it must be stated before it can be solved.

It has always been such an evading problem! Who can say just what it is in particular? Is it a struggle between labor and capital? And, pray, what is labor, and what is capital? Is it a struggle between the landless and the landed? And what does it mean to be an owner of land? Search most diligently and you will findt hat at the very threshold stands this great difficulty of diagnosis. The doctors differ as to the disease, as well as to the treatment; while they wrangle, the patient becomes insane and attempts to murder them and his neighbors.

Indeed, the past history of the world shows very few attempts at finding any remedy. Repression, denial that any disease existed, was the favorite method. The strait-jacket was employed, or else the usual cure of stamping out disease by eliminating the diseased. When that failed, as it always did, then some sullen concession was made to enough of the stronger assailants, such as would suffice to make them of the other side. To the discredit of human nature, be it said, the stratagem was always successful. The rich plebeian, being allowed office and wealth, when he had attained them, straightway forgot his poor brethren.

Coming down to later times, what an array of civil riot and bloodshed is presented in the outbreak for bread, the raging despair of misery, the fury of those for whom the law had provided nothing but taxes and penalties. We recall the German Peasants' War, Jack Cade and Wat Tyler of England, French Blouses, and, we blush and wonder as we add it, scenes of bloodshed and pillage in these United States, whose stains have hardly been obliterated and whose losses have not yet been made good. We see shadows fluttering before us along the uncertain horizon upon which to-morrow's sun is to rise; ominous sounds that shape themselves into words, such as strikes, lockouts, boycotts. come floating toward us from that same direction, while the news of to-day is largely that which sets forth the organization of labor, under various titles, but always for the same end, the decrease of the hours of toil and the increase of wages, regardless of any economical considerations.

In a land in which the laborer is armed with the ballot, and much more likely to use it than the man of larger means or of

professional pursuits, the problem has an additional element of danger added to it. What a field for effort is presented here to the greedy eyes of the professional politician! What admirable themes for pot-house harangues and stump speeches! How deliciously can such epithets as "bloated bond-holder," purse-proud capitalist, money king, oppressor of the poor, and still coarser and more ingeniously contrived expressions, be made to give point and venom to the campaign conducted in the name of labor, and ended, if successful, in the pillage of property. Our state capitols may furnish a new chapter of the incidents of "carpet bag" administration, and our national government narrowly, if at all escape. Then, in the inevitable reaction, the cause of labor will suffer terribly, and with that suffering the whole progress of national life be retarded. We dare no more consider such possibilities visionary than those had right to declare and believe any civil war an idle dream, who demonstrated the absurdity of that awful struggle until the contest had actually begun. The war waged by one class of society upon another class, will be a worse one than that waged by one geographical section of a country upon another.

But what of prevention, what of remedy? We believe that all theories of treatment based upon a selfish appeal to men's rights will turn out to be mere surface healing. The disease is in the blood, and not the skin of the body politic. Concessions based upon fear, upon temporary prospect of mutual gain, upon efforts to adjudicate proportional value of services rendered, will be truces and not lasting treaties of peace. They can never amount to demonstration, and will therefore not satisfy the reason. Something will always remain to be said or argued when occasion prompts; the force of intuitive truth is demanded, a moral axiom must be the bulwark.

We believe that the parable from which we have borrowed a title will prove good reading in the construction of a line of conduct based upon the confession of man's duty to his fellow man, as a brother, as a son of the same great Father, rather than as a mental or physical force producing certain values. We believe that after all the learned discussions upon the labor problem it will have to come to this, that we will be constrained to settle

the question after a Christian fashion, and find in that fact a new impetus for the need of home missions, moral reforms, better administration of those laws which restrain vicious indulgences and temptations, and better men, spiritually and morally, to administer them. Christian men will see at last that as Christian citizens they have a great deal more to do than simply to pray for those who are in authority, if they wish to lead quiet and peaceable lives in all godliness and honesty. If such a sense of responsibility can be awakened in the conduct of business, in the use of wealth, in the exercise of power, it will go hard with us indeed if individuals, backed by such public opinion, shall have need of artificial and unnatural associations in order to obtain a generous penny a day.

Christianity has been Labor's best friend, and the Church of Christ has advocated its cause most efficiently at all times. Labor makes its greatest error when it forsakes the methods of the Gospel to gain its ends, and takes its tone and attitude from the man whose god is his appetite and whose heaven is free indulgence in it. Just as fashions of dress which start a great way off from home may originate with those with whom the lady who dons the fashionable style would hesitate to associate, so fashions of thought may come down from sources so dubious morally that a decent workman would indignantly repudiate them, could he trace them back. What is hostile to Christ and the Ten Commandments, is not friendly to the cause of labor, and cannot be.

If we examine the history of labor, we will find that with the increasing power of a new Christianized civilization its condition has been steadily improving. There is no reason, consequently, to distrust the future from that source. In a word, existing institutions have been moulded all along in favor of the laboring man, are still being shaped in his favor, and he is a fool to endeavor to overthrow them. If any reformation is needed, it is a conservative, and not a radical one; it must deal with the abuses of our social system, and, notably, with some for which the laboring man is more largely responsible than any other class of the community.

Let us look at this history of Labor. It begins with Labor as a slave. How it had become such, by war or otherwise, it matters not; that was its condition. No one worked voluntarily at anything which was considered servile toil. All women and the slaves did such work, and they together formed practically one class—the slave class. Mental toil was hardly discriminated from physical; it was, all of it, slave work also. Artist and artisan were one and the same, except at times the one master spirit. War was man's work, the council chamber and the throne and festal board his rightful place; women and slaves might do the work and be the rewards, but could not share as partners in the direction or the honor.

Labor made its first gain in becoming part of the estate instead of being a movable chattel. Of course, it was but a sorry gain to be a serf, but it was something. And as wars ceased somewhat and captives became less plentiful, prudence would in general dictate a coarse benevolence, which fits of passion and cruelty would rather interrupt than destroy. Some individual cases were no better off than before, but, as a whole, the body of laboring men was better off; it had a local habitation, it was a domesticated animal rather than a half-tamed wild thing to be killed without thought. A master might have some sentimental affection for his serfs, just as he had some for the rocks and rills, the forest and the meadows of his ancestral estate.

Labor's first great gain was when it was conceded to have a soul, a right to virtue, and the prospect of a judgment bar arose before men's eyes at which there was no respect of persons. The Church recognized only souls in its dealings with humanity, in its rites and sacrifices; even its offices were without respect to previous condition of servitude. Still the progress of a principle is not rapid when it must push its way through the barriers of custom and tradition. Long after the theory is acknowledged the practice will remain anomalous. Only the break down of the feudal system, the rise of free towns and the substitution of trade and manufactures for war and pillage accomplished the emancipation of Labor.

So, finally, Labor became a citizen with the meagre glory of political consideration, but hardly with the substantial comfort

of good living. His nation gloried in his freedom, but sent him to rot in jail for paltry debt, or hanged him without compunction for hunger-impelled crime. St. Giles was still a great way off from St. James. In the New World, or at least in some parts of it, the laborer had matters pretty much to himself. Or, one might say, there was no distinct class of laborers, each one supporting himself by the toil of his own hands. Yet here too when Labor put in his distinctive appearance, his recompense was astonishingly meagre. Wages were as low as materials for raiment and shelter were high. It was emphatically brown bread and little else.

Contrast this slowly rising condition of the man whose capital consists of much muscle, little brain power, certain mechanical dexterity acquired by drill, little inventive force, with the position of decency which he holds to-day, and say whether or not Labor has not profited more by Christian civilization than any other class of the community. Consider the tremendous difference between Labor as a slave and Labor as a voter and politician, and ask yourself whether it has any justification in becoming a tyrant. If the question be one of selfish legal right, devoid of duty and charity, it would be only a poetic justice which would enthrall Labor as the demagogue's slave while seeking to overthrow the standing column of the state.

Another line of investigation seems to be desirable as a preliminary study of the Labor problem in its present aspect. We ought to consider what effect the division of labor has had upon the mass of humanity once rudely classed as servile in their toil. For it is not every class of labor which seeks by combination and organization to better itself. Certain classes stand aloof altogether from such an effort, and are hardly recognized by the others as laborers at all. It will be found that mainly those whose toil is pre-eminently physical, needs but little "book learning," does not handle pen or pencil, are classed as laborers, while the others are called clerks, or some such thing. That is, the more Labor has conformed itself to the conditions of the age, the better off it is; the less it has grasped the fact of a rising standard of intellectuality, or has been unable to grasp it, the more helpless it is. Naturally the complaint comes from

the more helpless, and the remedy to be sought for, is a remedy for those who in this division of labor, either through moral or intellectual incapacity, are being sifted down to the lowest and poorest place. The rest can take care of themselves, in the main are doing so.

The most serious change in the problem has been brought about by the invention and introduction of machinery. The machine is a slave, a slave without a soul to be considered or a will to resist; a slave without nerves but with gigantic muscles. Free citizen labor cannot compete with such steel and steam slave labor; the only opening left for Labor as a citizen is to be an overseer of machines, an operative as we call it. But not every one can own so costly a slave as many a machine is; hence a division of values produced, or profits and wages,—and hence a quarrel in "posse," if not in "esse." Once more, these machines are only profitable if put to their full powers, and on a large scale of combination. They live by the common breath of steam; their heart throbs are the to and fro of the piston rod. He who drives a hundred rather than ninety by the same engine, has the advantage. Given a market for all he makes, granted executive ability to manage a large business, and the man who manufactures upon a large scale has superior power to buy, to make, to sell, to gain, over that one whose apparatus is small and whose business is limited.

Here is the necessity for wages, for the employé, for the employer; here is the edge of battle. The Labor problem is a question of wages more largely than anything else. It is such because machinery has driven Labor into co-operation of effort, since by such co-operation it can most economically produce enhanced values. Again, that same fact necessitates a head, a master, since in any co-operation there must be an executive, and in such a complicated and extensive affair an able executive.

And now we must introduce the most interesting and important factor in the problem,—the captain of industries, the "entrepreneur," the master builder, contractor, executive. It is his existence that makes co-operation possible, just as for war we must have a general. We might have fighting without generalship, in fact we have had it, and very disastrous it was: so too

we can have manufacturing carried on without its true captaincy, but either on a small, very small scale, or else to a failure. As with able generals, so with these captains of industry the number in each generation is not so very great. Of course there is a larger number of ability enough to act as lieutenants and sergeants, that is as assistants, "bosses," sub-functionaries and the like.

Let us repeat it; the workman working alone cannot compete with the combination of man, machine, and captain. He must enter into the combination and accept such a function in it as he is capable of executing. If that be one of mere mechanical effort, he is like a private soldier in an army, and is paid accordingly. If his ability is more than that, he is somewhat better off, a corporal or sergeant, as it were. If he can bring such services as place him among the commissioned officers, at once his pay and rank are such that he is no more known as a laborer. If he has enlisted this army himself, is managing its warfare himself, is captain or general, then the pay is highest of all, and the lion's share, or, in case of disaster, his is the loss, the entire loss.

In our land the quarrels of more recent date have been between these captains of industry and the rank and file of their armies. Employés have "struck;" employers have "locked out." The question at issue has been the demand for higher wages, a larger share of the supposed or actual profits. The rank and file do not propose to allow such a gap to exist between their pay and a major-general's pay. If the general can afford a large house and an expensive style of living, the "high private" will not be satisfied with a small house and an economical style of living. He has turned materialist and sees no value in living unless it is epicurean. He has become better educated and more refined, and his soul craves for things of beauty and surroundings of elegance. He is besotted, and demands infinite beer and tobacco. Be it what it may, this high private for reasons high or low, right or wrong, has declared that generals are too well paid, or, rather, that he wants more money and he must have it. What are we going to do about it? Suppose that he is all wrong; how will that help matters? Talk

about killing the goose that lays the golden egg; but in this case the community which "lays the golden egg" will have but little satisfaction in thinking how mistaken Sir Labor will find himself after its killing.

Here then is the immediate issue involved, if not the entire labor problem. It is not widely a labor question, but narrowly the question of wages in those co-operations and combinations of men and machines engaged in production or transportation under captains; and the issue is the relative share as between captain and private. It is something gained if we can stand by this statement and brush away the fallacies which have been gathering about this whole matter and threatening bloodshed and anarchy.

For instance, it has been represented that this is a war between the laborer and the capitalist; and by the latter has been meant any man of property or wealth. The capitalist has been represented as a sort of human spider fattening on the life-blood of working men, women, and children. He has been made odious in their eyes until some of them, it may be, begin to think that killing him would be no murder, but rather a virtue, and the destruction of his property has become a patriotic duty. Now the ownership of property or the possession of wealth has nothing to do with this question of relative wages, except in so far as it would be impossible to have these combinations without such ownership. For it constitutes the sinews of war, and no war can take place without arms, ammunition and supplies.

It is a mere accident, however, whether the employer owns the wealth or somebody else loans it to him; it is very seldom that he employs his own exclusively, no matter how much he has. If he have the reputation of being a skillful general, and of being an honorable man, he can get as much as he needs. The fact is that money in itself considered gets very little for its service. The legal rates of interest centre about six per cent. The actual returns for money invested securely and without any labor accompanying it can be measured by what it receives when put into United States bonds, state, city and school bonds, first mortgages on home properties, less the tax levied upon it. Other investments represent a decided application of ingenuity and a

constant, watchful care, which must be charged for and reckoned in. Money, as money, without all this care and labor, brings in less and less, generation after generation, Labor has no quarrel with capital in that sense; its only quarrel can be that money is freely loaned to the captain, and not to the private, and that being thus provided with the sinews of war, he can make a campaign which the private cannot, which the less richly endowed captain cannot, and dictate the hire of his private soldiery, whose only recourse is to mutiny and defeat him while they starve themselves and ruin the property owners who loaned this captain their money, directly as shareholders and bondholders, or indirectly as depositors in some bank of discount.

It is equally plain that the ownership of land has nothing to do with this vexed question save in the same way, since it is the condition of society upon which all its wealth rests, the fulcrum for the leverage of manufactures and transportation and exchange and food-production. The land again would be so worthless if all the labor put into it or upon it were deducted from its estimated value, that the question becomes one of this sort, whether a man has the right to conserve his savings of labor, or give them by bequest or sale to some one else. To deny this would be to deny that a man has a personal right to the fruits of his toil, that he cannot do what he would with his own. Of course there are some men, who have nothing, willing to go to that length; others cheerfully draw the line at a figure beyond that which they expect to reach. To believe that the law shall fix an equable, not an equal or equally proportionate, charge for political expenses upon varying fortunes is not to deny the rights of ownership in land or any other form of property.

To say that this question must be settled upon the basis of competition is to leave it undecided altogether, an eternally varying question of demand and supply in any one neighborhood or species of occupation. This is going to war after the fashion of those days when the "free lances" formed the staple of armies and were bought and sold, faithless alike to all upon any pretext, trusted thoroughly by none; and even they were in turn under a captain who sold them for his own advantage more

than their own. Just here the question might be raised with some speculation, whether the leaders of labor movements are or are not the modern representatives of the captains of free lances of by gone days.

Besides, if the question of supply and demand be brought in, how about the demand and the supply of captains of industry? Are they so plentiful? Are able railroad presidents as plentiful as blackberries? Are competent managers, skillful business men, successful manufacturers caught in shoals like herring? When one considers how few they are, and what their work is, he does not wonder at their wages. On the basis of rights, of supply and demand, perchance they get no more than their dues.

But can we decide this question upon any consideration of productive ability, even if by some supernatural wisdom a scale of perfectly adjusted wages could be established for every worker from the most menial and least necessary up to the very brain and soul of the most extensive and complicated co-operation? Evidently we could not discover such a scale; it must to a considerable extent be arbitrary, and therein is the constantly abiding source of hostility. But if we could do this unheard-of thing, would it not rest upon the supposition that I am not my brother's keeper, that every man does live to himself, that another's condition has no reflex effect upon mine or the welfare of us all? What if my brother, by the act of God, or by the course of inherited blunders which his parents have committed, knowingly or unknowingly, or by my past neglect for him or them, is unable to produce such a share of the common values as will entitle him to a portion placing the decencies of life at his command? What then? Must he go without them? Am I to look on and let him degenerate into savagery and say, what is that to me; see thou to that? Is that the intention of our common Father in heaven? Why was a certain one born blind? Was it because he had sinned, or because his parents had sinned? Or was it that the glory of the Lord might be manifested? And who is now, among us, to manifest that glory if it be not those who are strong?

And so we come upon the line of the parable of the house-

holder as after all the only practicable line that has ever been surveyed across the broken country of this world's life. That householder paid to every man his penny, not because each one had produced equal values, but because each one had equal necessities. He paid out in gospel money and not in the old legal coin. This is not only sound doctrine, but it is good hard common sense. We cannot afford to have paupers in a community, and the best and cheapest way out of it is to keep all sorts of remuneration up to a decent self-respecting standard, even if the captains do not get so much salary. In that case they too must balance their accounts by charging up the deficit to honor, or, better yet, to glorifying God. If one will eat white bread, it does him credit, but he cannot expect to feed so bountifully as that one who is content with brown. Professions, trades, and callings differ at times inversely in honorableness from their cash values; a head cook at a club gets higher wages than a professor at most of our colleges.

It may not be out of place to point to the fact that our system of doing things inclines largely already in this direction. Who pays for the sidewalk, the paved street, the lighted avenue, the guard of police? Who builds the public school-house, engages the teacher, even supplies the text book if necessary? Who endows churches, colleges, hospitals, asylums, museums? Who foots the bills for all those things that make a mechanic's wages sufficient to furnish him with comforts that no king could obtain a hundred years ago? Who, in a word, is the tax-payer? Property pays the taxes! The only tax that can be readily enforced or collected from the man without property is that which entitles him to vote, and even that is too often paid for him by the political party. If he has done his share toward advancing civilization, has not civilization done much for him in return? Ought not these things be reckoned among the returns given to him for his toil? If machinery has taken him from his little workshop and his two or three apprentices or journeymen, and made him an operative, it has not been without some considerable compensation of opportunity by which he may retain his own manhood, and his children reach a higher

one. Having the facilities of education before him, the youth of our land may promote himself, if he have capacity, into a captain. Is it not a fact that most of our captains of to-day have done this very thing? Who were they, if not poor boys from the farm, from obscure ranks of life? Does it not seem almost a disadvantage to have been born of rich, even if respectable, parentage? Will the laborer in his zeal destroy the opportunities of his sons and grandsons?

What we need is rather to continue in the same line of progress, improving our practice, elevating public opinion, making it disgraceful not to be public spirited, causing the unwilling, for shame's sake, to do what the willing do for love's sake. It is an old fallacy to imagine that making new laws or establishing new institutions will do away with the necessity of that faithful execution, for lack of which the old laws proved inefficient. No measure or method can get along without the man! Give us the right sort of men as employers and employés, and they will settle their respective wages without the intervention of strangers or the waste of dues and assessments. Christianize employer and employé and you will have the right sort of men.

To further a movement in this direction, it will become all who are anxious to aid it that they give their attention to certain civic economies. Ignorance and vice are the two great leaks in the social machinery. Enough steam escapes there to run a small engine. Ignorance and vice are two deadly foes of the laborer. The sources of ignorance can be dried up by church and school, but the temptations to vice can hardly be fought without the aid of the law. Without question one such temptation is the drinking habit, the saloon life of so many of the sons of toil. Without regard to the attitude assumed as to the principle of total abstinence, or even the sale of liquor, it seems to stand to reason that the existence of so many places whose only cause of being is that men may guzzle, is a barbarism. It is a fearful cause of wages not reaching out to pay store bills; it is a great discouragement when the employer finds that the only result of increased wages is that more liquor is drunk; it is a sad commentary when the explanation of intoxication, public and shameless, in a manufacturing town, is that pay-day

has come around. It is not within the scope of this article to do more than indicate this leak as one that must be stopped, if men are to be Christianized; we cannot preach the Gospel to drunken men. Nor can there be a home life among those whose evenings are all spent at the saloon. Nor can we ever have purer politics as long as the saloon is the starting point of political management, and the easy instrument of political bribery. In the expressive slang of our day, we must "boycott" the saloon in order to make labor respectable. By doing so some other classes of society will also be aided.

Then again labor will be largely aided by making it disreputable to have no legitimate occupation. No citizen has a moral right to be without a lawful occupation. It is not a question as to whether he has property or not; rich loafers are just as obnoxious as penniless tramps, and neither class should be tolerated in a republic. Idleness breeds vice. Wealthy idleness becomes the tempter and the temptation; indigent idleness falls victim, becoming the tempted, and then in turn the tempter.

Once more, as long as materialism prevails so alarmingly instead of a sound and pure spirituality, there is little hope for any class in the state. One cannot help seeing how intense is the love of money, the greed of gain, the worship of mammon, the pride in an ostentatious display of it, the corresponding longing for it and hatred of those having it by the disappointed. The necessities and even the decencies of life are not so hard to get, in our land at least, by the sober and industrious, but men are not satisfied with these; they must have the luxuries also. Labor is battling for fine apparel and the means of indulgence; it must be as well dressed as wealth, go to the same theatres, indulge in the same amusements, feast upon the same dainties. Here again there is but one remedy to quell the vulgar ostentation of the purse-bound and the foolish, sensuous, ambitions of the earner of wages. The first requisite of a healthy growth is that it be free from parasites; society will never bud and blossom and bring forth fruit of Paradise until it be rid of this parasitical life that feeds upon it and starves and stunts it. Scientific theories, political economy essays, all such wisdom, may essay the task as they please, but they will never solve the Labor

problem or any other problem of life until they approach it from the direction of the Gospel revealed to mankind by Him who gave Nature her laws and Society her existence. There is a divine plan and likewise a divine object of life; no living can be made a blessed thing which ignores this plan, despises this object and seeks to patch up an artificial method reaching out to an artificial end of its own. Life is to be spiritually lived; that is no true philosophy which ignores this fact, and no untrue philosophy will ever reconcile differences among men and inaugurate the reign of universal peace and good will. The trouble with much of our so-called wisdom is that it ignores these very facts or too often apologizes for the little Christianity which it shows, as though that were an amiable weakness, a sort of gentility of an antiquated school.

But if we can advance no new theory we can reach a very practical conclusion, and that is for each one of us, in the station and calling in which he is, to do his whole duty towards God and man. We are not to wait until every other man has done his duty, but begin at once to do our duty that we may provoke others to good works. We are not to reach out after unattainable things but do at once those things which are at hand. We are not to excuse ourselves from what is possible because of divers things that are impossible. We are not to despise little matters pretending that we are so anxious about grand ones.

Let the man of wealth study to use it as God's steward for the welfare of his humbler brethren. Let him find more pleasure in ministering to them than in being ministered unto by them. Let him devise liberal things for his own neighborhood, his own town. Let him be public spirited and not shun his civic and political duties. Let him cheerfully give of his substance and persistently examine into the use it is put to. Let him give his benefactions so that they may seem to be less of charity than of privilege. Let him remember the sturdy and commendable pride of the honest poor and foster it by such ways of assistance as show a brotherly interest rather than a lordly condescension.

Let the captain of industry show himself as chivalric as he is

strategic and successful. After all it is victory rather than plunder that should most delight his soul; let him be generous in dividing the spoils of battle. Let his own example teach those who have been gathered around him that there are higher aims in life than mere money aims. Let him strive to attach followers to him by personal affection, and not be discouraged because some are ungrateful. Let him seek to advance merit, be just and gracious, take pride in the welfare of his host and employ his superior abilities for them. This is a recipe for a happy life, if it be not one for a colossal fortune.

Let the laborer learn to find his happiness in a well-ordered and thrifty household, at home and not abroad. Let his combinations and organizations be to discourage vice, to increase his own stores of information, to learn better ways of home comfort, to understand more clearly who are his real friends and who his enemies in disguise. His savings will enrich him more rapidly than strikes and contributions to other strikers, and his good name will give him a choice of masters. Let him revive the trade of an honest day's work as the surest way of obtaining an honest day's wages. Let him refuse to play the tyrant over his fellow laborer or aid any one else to betray Labor under the plea of marshaling it to a perilous victory.

Let the Church of Christ see that it needs to bring the Gospel to infuse its light of love and life into all these classes. If it would save men and nations let it become more apostolic in being more missionary in its character. Let it not be contented with opening its gates, but send forth its messengers into highway and hedge and compel its guests to enter in and partake of the Gospel feast spread for them by the Master. Much as it has done, it can do more. It can apply the principles of the Gospel more closely to the life of those who profess its name. It can refuse to shelter those within its membership who palpably violate its principles. It can be more practical in its preaching, touching with no vague hints but in plain terms upon these very points. It may find its reward in attaining thus that very unity for which it prays. When saints of different confessions meet again and again upon the pathway of such good works, they will be more ready to desire agreement and more likely to find

it. The picture of those days when the brethren who had means devoted them to the relief of such as had none, is not a Utopian sketch, but a statement of historical fact; why should we hesitate to believe that such a day may come again? Its improbability lies with us, not with God, not with the constitution he has given to his creature society. At all events, whatever comes of it, it is our blessed duty, as far as in us lies, to see to it that no one stands in enforced idleness in the market place, no man having hired him, and that each man's penny a day be large enough to vouchsafe him the decencies of life, the needed hours of liberty from toil needed by a rational being, hope, courage, and self-respect sufficient to make it possible for us to lead him on to heed the Spirit's call in the preaching of that Gospel which sets forth the pursuit of eternal happiness.

ARTICLE VIII.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

ENGLISH.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.—*Commentary on the Gospel of John*, by F. Godet, with an historical and critical introduction, vol. II. translated from the third French edition, with a preface, introductory suggestions and additional notes, by Timothy Dwight. *The Book*, or When and by Whom the Bible was written, by the Rev. S. Leroy Blake, with an Introduction by Prof. M. B. Biddle, (Congregational Sunday School and Publishing Society). *Biblical Theology of the Old Testament*, based on Oehler, by Revere F. Weidner. *The Parables of our Saviour*, expounded and illustrated by Wm. M. Taylor, D. D., LL. D. *The Dragon, Image and Demon*, or the Three Religions of China, Confucianism, Buddhism, and Taoism, giving an account of the mythology, idolatry and demonolatry of the Chinese, by Rev. Hampden C. Du Bose, fourteen years a missionary in China. *Anglican Hymnology*, being an account of the 325 standard hymns of the highest merit according to the verdict of the whole Anglican Church, by Rev. J. King. *The Miraculous Element in the Gospels*, a course of lectures on the Ely Foundation delivered in Union Theological Seminary, by Alex. Balmain Bruce, D. D. *A Greek Lexicon of the New Testament*, being Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti, translated, revised, and enlarged by Jos. H. Thayer, D. D. *The Simplicity that is in Christ*, sermons by Leonard W. Bacon, D. D. *Messianic Prophecy*, the Prediction of the fulfillment of redemption

through the Messiah, a critical study of the Messianic passages of the Old Testament in the order of their development, by C. A. Briggs, D. D. *Twenty Sermons*, by Phillips Brooks. *Christ at the Door of the Heart*, and other sermons, by Morgan Dix. *The Book of Job*, with a new commentary, by Benj. Szold, Rabbi of the Oheb Shalom Congregation of Baltimore. *Ham-Mishkan*, the Wonderful Tent, by D. A. Randall, D. D. *The Story of the Four* [Evangelists], by the Rev. H. B. Haweis, A. M. *The Book of Revelation*, an Exposition, by Isaac P. Warren, D. D

SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL.—*Studies in Modern Socialism and Labor Problems*, by T. Edwin Brown, D. D., containing a brief history of Socialism, and an exposition of the theories. *Christian Thought*, lectures and papers on Philosophy, Christian Evidences, Biblical Elucidation, third series, edited by C. F. Deems. *An Account of the Progress of Zoölogy in the Year 1885*, from the Smithsonian Report for 1885, by Theodore Gill. *Herbert Spencer as a Biologist*, by H. Sewal, also Some Relation between Philosophy and Literature, by C. B. Burt, No. 4 of First series of University of Michigan philosophical papers. *Astronomy by Observation*, an elementary text-book for High Schools and Academies, by Eliza A. Brown. *Microbes, Ferments, and Moulds*, by E. L. Trouessart, vol. 56 of the International Scientific Series. *Outlines of Aesthetics*, dictated portions of the lectures of Herman Lotze, translated and edited by G. T. Ladd. *The Influence of Clothing on Health*, by Frederick Treves, F. R. C. S. Eng. *The Philosophy of Education*, from the German of Prof. Johann Karl Friederick Rosenkranz, of the University of Königsberg, edited by W. T. Harris, LL. D. (International Educational Series). *Psychology*, by John Dewey, Ph. D.

HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL.—*Men of Renown*, character sketches of men distinguished as Patriots, Statesmen, Writers, Reformers, Merchants, etc., by Daniel Wise, D. D. *Life and Memoirs of Cassius Marcellus Clay*, written and compiled by himself. *Our Government*, how it grew, what it does, and how it does it, by Jesse Macy. *A Hand-book of Politics for 1886*, being a record of important political action, Legislative, Executive, and Judicial, National and State, by E. McPherson. *Mary and Martha*, the mother and the wife of George Washington, by Benson J. Lossing, illustrated by fac-similes of pen-and-ink drawings by H. Rosa. *The Battle of Gettysburg*, from Comte de Paris' "History of the Civil War in America." *A History of Greek Literature*, from the earliest period to the death of *Demosthenes*, by Frank Byron Jevons, M. A. *The Stork Family in the Lutheran Church*, by John G. Morris, D. D., LL. D. *Literary Life* of Gustavus Seyffarth, an autobiographical sketch. *First Three Centuries*, a History of the Church of Christ, with a special view to the delineation of Christian faith and love from A. D. 1 to 313, by Islay Burns, D. D. *The Huguenots and Henry of Navarre*, by H. M. Baird. *Recollections of Eminent Men*, with other

papers, by E. P. Whipple, with introduction by Rev. C. A. Bartol, D. D.

TRAVELS.—*La Plata Countries of South America*, by E. J. M. Clemens, records of a journey, with descriptions and historical notes.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*A Hand-book of Christian Symbols and Stories of the Saints, as Illustrated in Art*, by Clara Erskine, edited by Katherine E. Conway. *The Latin Poems of Leo XIII.*, done into English verse, by the Jesuits of Woodstock College, published with the approbation of his holiness. *The Battle for Bread*, a series of sermons relating to Labor and Capital, by T. De Witt Talmage, D. D. *Recollections of College Life at Marshall College*, from 1839 to 1845, by Rev. Theo. Appel. *Our Country*, its possible future and its present crisis, by Rev. Josiah Strong, with an introduction by Austin Phelps, D. D., new issue. *A Revelation of the Secret Orders of Western Africa*, including an explanation of the beliefs and customs of African heathenism, by J. A. Cole. *Critical Miscellanies*, vol. III, by J. Morley. *Lectures on International Law in Times of Peace*, by J. Morton Pomeroy, edited by Theodore S. Woolsey. *The Rigveda*, the oldest literature of the Indians, by Adolf Kaegi, authorized translation with additions to the notes by R. Arrowsmith. *Woman's Work and Worth*, in girlhood, maidenhood, and wifehood, illustrations of woman's character, duties, rights, influence, &c., by W. H. Davenport Adams. *Orient*, with preludes on current events, Boston Monday Lectures, by Jos. Cook. *Legends and Popular Tales of the Basque People*, by Mariana Monteiro, with full-page illustrations in photogravure, by Harold Copping. *A Plain Man's Talk on the Labor Question*, by Simon Newcomb. *How to Win*, a book for girls, by Frances E. Willard. *Persia and the Persians*, by S. G. W. Benjamin. *American Literature*, 1697–1885, vol. I, The Development of American Thought, by Charles F. Richardson.

GERMAN.

THEOLOGICAL.—*Das Wesen der Wissenschaft und ihre Anwendung auf die Religion*. Past. Martin v. Nathusius. pp. 416. Leipsic. *Der Heilsrat Gottes*. Schriftgem sse Betrachtungen nach der Ordnung der Christlichen Heilslehre in Worten der heiligen Schrift. Gen. Sup't Dr. Karl Ernst. 2 ed. pp. 91. Wiesbaden. Third edition of Thomasius' great work *Christi Person und Werk*. Darstellung der Evangel. Luther. Dogmatick vom Mittelpunkte der Christologie aus. Edited by F. J. Winter. I. Bd. Die Voraussetsungen der Christologie u. die Person des Mittlers. pp. 642. Erlangen. *Die Lehre Jesu*. Prof. Dr. H. H. Wendt. I. Thl. Die Evangelischen Quellenberichte über die Lehre Jesu. pp. 353. Göttingen. Second edition of Dorner's *System der Christlichen Glaubenslehre*. 1 Bd. Grundlegung od. Apologetik. pp. 749. Berlin. *Philosophie und Religion*. Neue Beiträge zur wissenschaftlichen Grundlegung der Dogmatik. Rich. Adelb. Lipsius. pp. 319. Leipsic. *Zur Lehre vom Heiligen Abendmahl*. H. Schultz. pp. 133. Gotha. *Zur Lehre von der Behehrung* und von der

Prädestination. 2. Entgegng. gegen missourische Ausflüchte. A. W. Dieckhoff. pp. 148. Rostock. *Die Wahlfreiheit des Willens*, in ihrer Nichtigkeit dargelegt. W. Meyer. pp. 218. Gotha. *Der Ursprung der Religion.* Dr. C. F. Heman. pp. 64. Basel. *Inbegriff der Christlichen Lehre.* Heinr. W. J. Thiersch. pp. 396. Basel. *Darstellung und Beurtheilung der A. Ritschl'schen Theologie.* Zur Orientirung dargeboten. Pfr. Ludw. Haug. pp. 118. Ludwigsburg. *Das Gebet.* Historisch, dogmatisch, ethisch, liturgisch und pastoral-theologisch betrachtet. Wilh. Wiener. pp. 188. Gotha.

BIBLICAL.—*Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel.* Prof. Lic. Dr. Carl H. Cornill. pp. 515. Leipsic. *Supplement* to the 3. ed. of Cremer's Biblisch-Theologisches Worterbuch der Neutestamentlichen Gräcität. pp. 63. Gotha. *Die Heilige Schrift des Neuen Testaments*, Zusammenhängend untersucht. J. C. K. v. Hofman. II. Thl. Biblische Theologie des neuen Testaments, nach manuscripten u. Vorlesgn. bearb. v. W. Volck. pp. 328. Nordlingen. Fifth edition of Bleek's *Einleitung in die heilige Schrift.* 1. Thl. Einleitung in das Alten Testament. pp. 634. Berlin. *Der Brief an die Epheser.* 8. Abth. Meyer's Kritisch Exegetischer Commentar üb. das Neue Testament. 6. verbesserte Auflage besorgt durch Wold. Schmidt. pp. 328. Göttingen. *Wellshausens Methode*, Kritisch beleuchtet. Past. O. Naumann. pp. 166. Leipsic. Fourth edition of Bleek's *Einleitung in die heilige Schrift* besorgt von Consist. R. Prof. Dr. Wilh. Mangold. 2. Thl. Einleitung in das Neue Testament. pp. 1035. Berlin. *Die Waldenser und die deutschen Bibelübersetzungen.* Nebst Beitragen zur Geschichte der Reformation. L. Keller. pp. 189. Leipsic. *Kommentar.* Kurzgefasster, zu den heiligen Shriften Alten und Neuen Testaments, sowie zu den Apokryphen. Unter Mitwirkung von Burger, Klostermann, Kübel, etc., hrsg. von Herm. Strack, u. Otto Zöckler (In 12 Abtlgn.) B. Neues Testament. I. Abtlg.: *Die Evangelien nach Matthäeus, Markus u. Lukas*, ausgelegt v. C. F. Nösgens. pp. 423. Nördlingen. *Historisch-Kritische Einleitung in das Alte Testament.* W. Vatke. Nach Vorlesgn. hersg. v. H. G. S. Preiss. pp. xviii. 754. Bonn. *Der Prophet Iesaia.* C. J. Bredenkamp. 1. Lfg. Cap. 1–12, pp. 84. Erlangen. *Die Gleichnissreden Jesu.* I. Hälfte. Allgemeiner Thl. Pred. Dr. A. Jülicher. pp. 291. Freiburg 1. Br.

HISTORICAL.—*Die Aufhebung des Ediktes von Nantes* im Oktober 1685. Prof. Dr. Thdr. Schott. pp. 167. Halle. *Conciliengeschichte.* C. J. v. Hefele. Nach den Quellen bearbeitet. 5. Band. 2. Aufl. Edited by A. Knopfler. pp. 1206. Freiburg i. Br. *Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Ausgang d. Mittelalters.* I. Bd. Das Zeitalter der Renais sance bis zur wahl Pius X. L. Pastor. pp. xlvi. 723. Freiburg i. Br. *Missions-Methoden* im Zeitalter der Apostel. 2 vorträge im Akadem. Missionsverein zu Erlangen. Prof. Dr. A. Zahn. pp. 48. Er-

langen. *Assyrien und Babylonien.* Nach den neusten Entdeckungen. 3. abermals erweiterte Aufl. mit Titelbild, 78 in den Text gedruckten Holzschn. 6 Tonbilder. Prof. Dr. Fr. Kaulen. pp. 266. Freiburg i. Br. *Luther's Briefwechsel.* Bearbeitet und Erläuterungen versehen von Pfr. Dr. Ernst Ludw. Enders. I. Bd. Briefe vom Jahre 1507 bis Marz 1519. pp. 494. Frankfort a. M. *Geschichte der Erziehung und des Unterrichts bei den Israeliten.* Von der vortalmudischen zeit bis auf die Gegenwart. Mit einem Anhang: Bibliographie der jüdischen Pädagogie. B. Strassburger. pp. 310. Stuttgart. Fourth enlarged edition of Uhlhorn's *Der Kampf des Christentums mit dem Heitentum.* Bilder aus der Vergangenheit als Spiegelbilder für die Gegenwart. pp. 438. Stuttgart. *Abriss einer Geschichte der evangelischen Kirche* auf dem europäischen Festlande in 19. Jahr-hundert. pp. 204. Stuttgart. *Zinzendorf im Verhaltniss Zu Philosophie und Kirchentum seiner Zeit.* Geschichtliche Studien. Bern. Becker. pp. 580. Leipsic. *Aegypten und Aegyptisches Leben im Altertum.* Mit über 300 Abbildungen im Text und 10 Vollbildern. Doc. Dr. Adf. Erman. (In 15 Lfgn.) 1–8 Lfg. pp. 360. Tübingen. *Das religiöse Leben des Deutschen Volkes am Ausgange des Mittelalters. Dr. Rich. Weitbrecht.* [Sammlung von Vorträgen,] hrsg. von W. Frommel u. F. Pfaff. pp. 58. Heidelberg. *Lebensbilder aus der Pietistenzeit.* Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte u. Würdigung d. späteren Pietismus Renner. pp. 409. Bremen. Second edition of Thomasius' unsurpassed History of Doctrines: *Die Christliche Dogmengeschichte,* als Entwickelungs-geschichte d. kirchlichen Lehrbegriffs dargestellt. 1. Bd. Die Dogmengeschichte der alten Kirche. Periode der Patristik. pp. 620. Erlangen.

HOMILETICAL.—*Luther's Ungedruckte* Predigten aus den Jahren 1528 bis 1546. Andreas Poach's handschriftliche Sammlung. Aus dem Originale zum erstenmahle hrsg. von Lic. Dr. Geo. Buchwald. 11. Bd. Predigten aus den Jahren 1528, 1529, 1530. I. Halfte. pp. vii, li, 176. *Dasselbe.* 3. Bd. Predigten aus den Jahren 1537 and 1538. pp. 272. Leipsic. *Licht und Leben.* Predigten zumeist in der Universitätskirche zu Leipzig gehalten. Dr. Chr. Ernst Luthardt. pp. 144. Leipsic. *Dein Gott, Mein Gott.* Sammlung von Traureden. E. Ohly in Verbindg mit Freunden hrsg. 2. Aufl. pp. 371. Wiesbaden. "*Sei Wacker und starke das andere, das sterben will.* Eine Sammlung v. Predigten, Reden u. Ausprachen vom Gebiete der inneren Mission. E. Ohly in Verbindung mit Freunden hrsg. pp. 290. Wiesbaden. *Fur Zeit und Ewigkeit.* Predigten auf alle Sonn. u. Festtage d. Kirchenjahres. P. Kaiser. 2. Aufl. pp. 613. Gotha. *Festpredigten.* Friedr. Spitta pp. 151. Bonn. A most excellent collection of sermons preached on the festivals of Advent, Christmas, New Year, Lent, Easter, Ascension, &c. *Die ewige Erlösung.* Evangelische Predigten. Prof. Dir. d. Theol. Sem. Dr. Eng. Lachsse. pp. 148. Gütersloh. Sermons of evangelical

force and great merit. *Gottesgrüsse.* Predigten. 2. Bd. Gehalten im Letzten Kirchenjahre zu Leipzig. Consist. R. Prof. Dr. Fricke. pp. 295. Leipsic.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*Verfassung, Cultus u. Disciplin der Christlichen Kirche* nach den Schriften Tertullians. J. Kolberg. pp. 226. Braunsberg. *Geschichte der Ethik.* Th. Ziegler. 2. Abtlg.: Geschichte der Christlichen Ethik. pp. 594. Strasburg. *Jesus in Bildern aus Seinem Leben.* Pfr. Friedr. Zündel. 2. neu durchgearb. u. verm. Aufl. pp. 436. Zurich. *Ein neuer Paulus.* Immanuel Kant's Grundlegung zu einer sicheren Lehre von der Religion, dargestellt. Dr. Heinr. Romundt. pp. 309. Berlin. *Missionstunden.* Past. Dr. G. Warneck. 2. Bd. Die Mission in Bildern aus ihrer Geschichte. 1. Abtlg.: Afrika und die Südsee. 2. verm. Aufl. pp. 331. Gütersloh. Tenth edition of Gesenius' Hebräisches u. Aramäisches *Handworterbuch* üb. das Alte Testament. Bearb. v. F. Mühlau u. W. Volck. pp. xlii., 984. Leipsic. *Geschichte der neueren Philosophie* von Nikolaus von Kues bis zur Gegenwart. Im Grundriss dargestellt. Privatdoc. Dr. Rich. Falckenberg. pp. 493. Leipsic. *Theologischer Jahresbericht.* Unter Mitwirkung von Böhringer, Dreyer, Ehlers, &c., hrsg. von R. A. Lipsius. 5. Bd. enhaltend die Literatur des Jahres 1885. pp. 566. Leipsic.

ARTICLE IX.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

On Sale by J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia.

A History of German Literature. By W. Scherer. Translated from the Third German Edition by Mrs. F. C. Conybeare. Edited by F. Max Müller. Two Vols. pp. 401, 425. 1886.

No other nation can exhibit treasures of literature surpassing those with which Germany has enriched the world. Prof. Scherer presents in these volumes a review of these treasures, the most complete and the most charming known to us in the English tongue. The fair translator has done her work so well that we forget in reading that this is a translation and keep thinking only of the author's superior merits, his masterful familiarity with the great subject, his subtle analysis of literary creations, his just and peaceful criticisms and his uncommon tact in sketching the personal characteristics of the authors at the same time that he is delineating their intellectual productions.

The work embraces the history of German literature from the earliest times to the death of Goethe. The first chapter traces the roots of

German nationality back to the period preceding the Aryan separation, and presents a picture of the intellectual condition of our Teutonic forefathers at the time when they became known to the Romans. The second chapter treats of the rise and development of the German hero-legends in the epoch of the migrations, and during the Merovingian period. The third is devoted to the Mediæval Renaissance, the chief literary achievements of which consisted in prose and verse translations from the Bible, in short political songs and poetic tales, and in the Latin dramas of the nun Roswitha. The fourth to the seventh chapters covering the eleventh to the middle of the fourteenth century, embrace the classical period of Middle High-German lyric and epic poetry, the era of chivalry and the crusades, of The Niebelungen, the Minnesang and the Meistersang, of Wolfram von Eschenbach and Walther von der Vogelweide. The eighth and ninth chapters include the next three hundred years, the period of transition from Middle High-German to the New High-German, the epoch marked pre-eminently by Luther's translation of the Bible, "the greatest literary event of the sixteenth century, or even of the whole period from 1348 to 1648." The tenth to the thirteenth chapters are devoted to the present epoch, which is marked especially by lyric and epic poetry, a period opened by the great Lutheran hymn-writer Paul Gerhardt and culminating in Goethe who completed in the secular sphere what Gerhardt began in the religious.

It is most gratifying to find so keen a critic of literature as Scherer, at the same time so capable of estimating the grandeur and sweetness of a life like Paul Gerhardt's. Of his hymns he says: "Many of them have really become sacred popular songs, in which millions of faithful souls still continue to find edification. These hymns combined all that could appeal to wide circles of readers—narratives of sacred events in ballad form, instructive and pregnant thoughts, devout fervor, a sublime view of divine things, and poetic glorification of domestic bliss." Scherer's appreciation of Luther's place in German culture coincides with that of all the great minds of Germany.

The Muses it is true, "were silenced for a while, and the voice of theology alone was heard," but "Luther created the Reformation in Germany" and "whether we glorify or condemn his action it is impossible to deny that the Reformation was of the greatest benefit to the intellectual life of the German nation. Those districts where the preaching of the Gospel did not prevail or where it was suppressed, remained for a long time shut off from any great intellectual or literary development. Without the enthusiasm of the reformed religion, without the educational influence which the Lutheran pastors exercised on the people, there was no mental progress."

A Chronological Table, a very copious Bibliographical Appendix, and a full Alphabetical Index add very much to the value of a work which deserves a place in the library of every scholar.

The Making of New England 1580–1643. By Samuel Adams Drake. With Many Illustrations and Maps. pp. 251. 1886.

This bright little book aims at meeting the want of brief, compact, and handy manuals of the beginning of our country. It seeks to so condense the exhaustive narrative as to give it greater vitality, or so extend and elucidate what the school history too often leaves obscure as to supply the deficiency. Mr. Drake is a recognized master in this species of authorship. Not only does he write entertainingly but with so supreme a regard for the exact and sober truth that the picturesque legends which encircle the Pilgrim and Puritan Fathers with a halo, are eliminated, and we are allowed to see their weaknesses as well as their virtues, their tyrannies side by side with their struggles for liberty.

The numerous illustrations are among the most attractive features of the work. Special emphasis is laid upon the home life and the various avocations of these pioneers, laying bare the foundations of character from which have risen so largely the distinctive features of the American people.

Age and youth alike will read these pages with interest and on reaching the end will regret that it comes so soon.

Messianic Prophecy; The Prediction of the Fulfilment of Redemption Through the Messiah. A Critical Study of the Messianic Passages of the Old Testament in the Order of Their Development. By Charles Augustus Briggs, D. D., Davenport Professor of Hebrew and the Cognate Languages in the Union Theological Seminary, New York City. pp. xx. 519. 1886.

The Old Testament rather than the New is the cynosure of all eyes in the theological world at present. The attacks of the school of Baur of Tübingen on the authority of the New Testament and its revelation, have resulted in a strong vindication of the traditional views of the Church. The attacks of advanced criticism on the Old Testament in our day and date, is, in the providence of God, proving to be a similar blessing to the revelation of Jehovah through Moses and the prophets. Not only are the internal and external evidences examined as to their bearing on the confirmation of the views of the Church as to authorship, date, integrity, and similar features of the Old Testament books, but the contents themselves, as to their character and scope and their import of the development of God's plans, are being more studied and better understood now than ever. Biblical theology has applied the historical spirit to the study of the Old Testament, and with the help of this correct historico-critical method of research is steadily making more clear the gradual unfolding of God's words and works in the revelation of the Old Testament. In this way a more historically correct picture of the Old Testament religion is being unfolded. And in no particular is this more the case than in regard to prophecy. The com-

mon notion that prophecy is simply prediction, and that nothing is prophecy unless it be prediction, is as erroneous as it is mischievous. A restriction of prophecy to this feature has deprived the Old Testament of much of its glory, especially in regard to its Messianic contents. The prophets were the preachers of their day, appointed by God to voice his will and providential direction of the education of his chosen people to become the bearers of the Messianic hope until there should, in the fulness of time, appear the Christ and Messiah. Prophecy was thus a living reality for the people of the old Covenant themselves. Prediction was indeed one of its offices, but only one, and not even the main one. In the same way not only is that Messianic which directly refers to the coming of a Redeemer in God's own time and hour, but everything, in history or promise, that refers to the development of God's plans for the restoration and re-establishment of man to the estate lost to him through sin. Accordingly the establishment of a covenant with Abraham and its readjustment to the needs of a nation at Mt. Sinai are as much Messianic features of the Old Testament as are the promises of Isaiah 40–66, although they may not reach the exalted height attained, for example, by Is. 53. But essentially and for God's purposes in history they are one in kind. Judged from this standpoint the breadth, length and depth of the Messianic element of the Old Testament are much richer in their scope and of greater importance in the Old Testament religion than it has generally been supposed to be.

Professor Briggs' work stands upon these truly evangelical principles. He states in the shape of theses the leading truths of the Messianic development, and then explains, with complete citation and literal translation of the text, these leading propositions. He follows the historical order, and thus can give a clear idea of the growth of the Messianic idea. The work is done in such a manner as to be especially useful to pastors and Sunday school teachers, while the advanced Hebraist will find his hands full in the copious exegetical and critical notes. No one would dream of asking us to agree in everything with Professor Briggs. He is a man of decided convictions, which are at times just as decidedly wrong. His work is much more conservative in contents than might have been expected from his well-known critical standpoint. It is full of good things, and we heartily commend it.

The Huguenots and Henry of Navarre. By Henry M. Baird, Professor in the University of the City of New York; Author of the Rise of The Huguenots of France. With maps. Two volumes. pp. 458, 525. 1886.

The "Rise of the Huguenots of France" published by Scribners some six years ago and the present work which though distinct from that continues the same heroic struggle and forms its proper companion, secure to Prof. Baird a place in the foremost rank of American Historians.

Of the former work an eminent French journal declared that nothing so complete had appeared in the French language and the two solid volumes which now succeed it are in no way inferior to it in literary merit or historical value. No publication of this class in our own country for many years has surpassed these volumes in importance and it may be safely predicted that they will be enrolled among the classics of American literature.

The author has manifestly had access to the multitudinous documents bearing on the Huguenot conflict and has canvassed them with painstaking industry, conscientious thoroughness and judicial discernment. From chapter to chapter he holds the reader's confidence in his mastery of the subject, his fidelity to the truth and the completeness and fairness of his statements and discussions. No attempt is made at fine writing though evidences of the author's capacity for it are not wanting. Neither is he given to philosophic digressions. The few instances of the kind which occur make one wish there had been more. And while there are picturesque characters, brilliant exploits, noble achievements and thrilling events offering material for a score of historical romances, the romantic element is kept in the background and no aim at dramatic effect reveals itself. The sober, consecutive and rapid narrative is left to tell undorned the story of a body of enlightened and brave Christian people, who contended for the freedom of conscience and the indefeasible rights of man and who deemed death in behalf of their cause the most glorious recompense of their faith and valor. It is a story that needs not the aids of rhetorical, romantic or philosophical flavor. It is an example of the "unadorn'd, adorn'd the most." The interest of the narrative never flags. The sympathetic spirit of the author, his careful marshalling of living details and thrilling events, his simplicity, lucidity and terseness of expression, go to make quite an animated and forcible style and win for the work as high praise for literary execution, as for its historical merits and its moral and religious value.

It is well that we should once in a while review the momentous struggle between Romanism and Protestantism, and note which side represented progress and liberal ideas, civil and religious freedom, not to speak of morality and spiritual worship. While we are wont to credit the Romanists with sincerity of motive and disposed to allow for the character of the age, the careful study of this history brings out clearly the fact that the leaders recognized the impossibility of settling religious controversy by force of arms, and more than once made the admission that such efforts to crush those who were fighting for liberty of conscience amounted to an attempt to conquer heaven. Yet confessing these now cardinal maxims and knowing their countrymen to be contending solely for freedom of faith and worship, they held them up to abhorrence as "the most terrible of rebels, the enemies of God," and subjected them to inhuman hardships and tortures. In this indifferent and spiritless

age, when we tolerate everything and forget everything, it is well that the strong light of the past should sometimes fall upon our slumbering vision, that we may at least be awakened to gratitude for the truth and the freedom we enjoy, by learning at what a cost they were obtained for us. One of the best opportunities for learning this is offered in these sterling volumes of Prof. Baird.

A History of Greek Literature: From the Earliest Period to the Death of Demosthenes. By Frank Byron Jevons, M. A., Tutor in the University of Durham. pp. 509.

We like to get hold of an author who is not only familiar with his theme but whose soul is in it. Such we have here. The ground he traverses is well known, and he writes from a glowing interest in his subject. He has, too, a good subject—one that is a delight to a mind infused with the classic spirit, and one that interpenetrates all the literatures since the days of Demosthenes. The author recognizes this, for he himself says (p. 484): "The history of Greek literature is the proper introduction to the study of literature in general, not merely because of the excellence of Greek literature in itself, and because it has influenced both directly and indirectly all subsequent European literatures, but because the causes which determine the development of literature in Greece are more easily discernible and more obvious in their operation than is the case in any other country."

The order here followed is not strictly chronological but one into which Greek literature naturally falls—first, the history of poetry and, second, that of prose, as the rise of poetry preceded prose. Of course, there is some overlapping chronologically, but the account is thus both simpler and in reality a truer view of the history. The first part is given in three divisions: Epic Poetry, Lyric Poetry, the Drama. The second is also in three: History, Oratory, Philosophy. In his account of Epic poetry he begins with Homer, not because there was no poetry before the Iliad, but because there is not a vestige of pre-Homeric poetry left. In Philosophy he closes with Plato, not carrying his history beyond the time of Demosthenes, when the political conditions changed and with them the language changed from pure Greek to Hellenistic Greek. The work is designed mainly for students in colleges and universities, but is well adapted for all intelligent readers—even those who have never studied Greek.

HARPER & BROTHERS, FRANKLIN SQUARE, NEW YORK.

A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, being Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti. Translated, revised and enlarged by Joseph Henry Thayer, D. D., Bussey Professor of New Testament Criticism and Interpretation in the Divinity School of Harvard University. Quarto, pp. 745. 1887.

No publication has appeared in many years for which we have waited

so eagerly and which we welcome so heartily as this great work of Prof. Thayer. Robinson's Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament had become useless for the present generation and Cremer's Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch der neutest. Gräcität, besides being quite expensive in English, is limited to a small number of words and adapted to scholars rather than to the ordinary students of the original Scriptures. It has at all events been found difficult to introduce Cremer generally, young divines preferring to invest in third-rate commentaries rather than study scientific works which render commentaries superfluous. Now, thanks to the patient toil of many years on the part of two of the foremost philologists of the age, we have at last a work accessible to all and adapted to humbler minds as well as the more learned, a work which serves the purposes of a dictionary, a concordance and a commentary, a work of which a very able reviewer says: "It is the one book above others which we shall employ daily for the elucidation of the New Testament."

It is said that Prof. Grimm of Jena gave seven years (1861–1868) of labor to this dictionary, basing it on the second edition of Wilke's "Clavis," 1851, and it has ever since maintained in Germany a very prominent place in biblical science. Grimm's second edition, greatly improved and enlarged, appeared in 1878. Among its distinctive merits is its embodiment of all the improvements in Greek Lexicography of the latest editions of Stephanus, Passow, Pape and other Greek lexicons completed since the current New Testament lexicons of Wahl, Bret-Schneider, Wilke, Bloomfield and Robinson appeared. Again, like Cremer, it pays special attention to the influence exerted upon the New Testament Greek by the language of the Septuagint, and by the Jewish-Greek literature which arose after the close of the Old Testament canon. It also takes account of the results of textual criticism, in accepted variations from the *Textus Receptus*. In its treatment of the several articles it combines to an unusual degree brevity, perspicuity and thoroughness.

Prof. Thayer's labor on this work is by no means confined to its translation. His thorough familiarity with the subject, his painstaking conscientiousness and tireless application for years have added improvements to the originial of great value and leave nothing to be desired.

In particular he has sought "to verify all references (biblical, classical and modern); to note more generally the extra-biblical usage of words; to give the derivation of words in cases where it is agreed upon by the best etymologists, and is of interest to the general student; to render complete the enumeration of (representative) verbal forms actually found in the New Testament (and exclude all others); to append to every verb a list of those of its compounds which occur in the Greek Testament; to supply the New Testament passages accidentally omitted in words

marked at the end with an asterisk; to note more fully the variations in the Greek text of current editions; to introduce brief discussions of New Testament synonyms; to give the more noteworthy renderings, not only of the 'Authorized Version,' but also of the Revised New Testament; to multiply cross references, references to grammatical works, both sacred (Winer, Buttmann, Green, etc.) and classical (Kühner, Krüger, Jelf, Donaldson, Goodwin etc.); also to the best English and American commentaries (Lightfoot, Ellicott, Westcott, Alford, Morison, Beet, Hackett, Alexander, 'The Speaker's Commentary,' 'The New Testament Commentary,' etc.), as well as the exegetical works that have appeared on the Continent (Weiss, Heinrici, Keil, Godet, Oltramare, etc.), and to the recent Bible Dictionaries and Cyclopædias (Smith, Alexander's Kitto, McClintock & Strong, the completed Riehm, the new Herzog, etc.), besides the various Lives of Christ and of the Apostle Paul."

One of the results of the editor's careful revision of the original is its adaptation for use with any of the current Greek texts. It includes, accordingly a multitude of new words and forms of which preceding lexicons take no account. The vocabulary comprises altogether 5420 words, of which 5260 have all their New Testament references given. The differences between classical and sacred usages of terms are carefully pointed out and copious references are made to the best recent works upon biblical geography, history, and antiquities, and especially to the new Bible dictionaries and cyclopædias. An appendix classifies the vocabulary of the New Testament, and points out the words peculiar to each book. And last, though certainly to many whose Greek training has been defective, not least, comes a catalogue of peculiar and singular verbal forms. We know of no other aid to Bible study that we can so conscientiously and heartily recommend to every minister and theological student.

Mary and Martha, the Mother and the Wife of George Washington. By Benson J. Lossing, LL. D., Author of "Field-Book of the Revolution," "Field-Book of the War of 1812," "Cyclopædia of U. S. History," etc. Illustrated by Fac-similes of Pen-and-Ink Drawings by H. Rosa. pp. 348. 1886.

Whether Mary and Martha Washington owe their fame entirely to their connection with the "Father of his Country," or whether Washington himself was largely indebted to his mother and his wife for the illustrious and peerless virtues which formed his character, is a question easily answered after the reading of this interesting sketch of domestic life from the pen of our popular historian. Dr. Lossing has enjoyed unusual facilities for collecting material and he has evidently been at pains to make the most of them. The work abounds in anecdotes, some of which are new to the public, and largely partakes of that gossipy style which has peculiar attractions for many readers.

It is pleasant to see that "Mrs. Washington was unaffectedly pious. It was her daily habit, from the time of her first marriage until her final departure from earth, to retire to her chamber immediately after breakfast to hold communion with her Maker—to read the Scriptures, meditate, and pray." But some will be shocked to read on the next page that "Mrs. Washington and her husband sometimes attended balls and parties given by fasionable persons at Alexandria and Annapolis. They also attended the theatrical performances at Williamsburg and Annapolis, of which both were very fond." To many it will be a strange and sad discovery that so good a son as George Washington never marked the grave of his mother and that our author offers no explanation for this apparently unfilial neglect. The execution of the volume by the publishers is superb and its external beauty added to the charms of the title and copious illustrations will make it a very desirable ornament for the parlor table.

Aristocracy in England. By Adam Badeau, Author of "Military History of Ulysses S. Grant" and "Conspiracy: A Cuban Romance." pp. 306. 1886.

General Badeau is a sprightly writer and has had unusual opportunities for studying the salient features of the British aristocracy. After twelve years spent in England, as an official of this country, he gives it as his "deliberate opinion that the relations of the aristocracy with the court, the government and politics, with the Church, with literature, the army and navy—even with trade and manufactures, and certainly with agriculture and the land, with the dependent classes and the very poor, constitute the pivot on which all English life revolves, the feature which is most marked in the national character and policy." The author shows very little sympathy with this hoary but now anomalous institution, expends a good deal of satire upon its foibles and vices, and in his cutting and carping language whether he describes English or American pretensions, he reminds you at times of the common gossip. A better spirit animates him when he portrays the personal character of the Queen and delineates the career of Gladstone, two chapters which are worth more than many times the cost of the little volume, and which will be appreciated by the best class of readers.

The Boy Travelers in the Russian Empire. By Thomas W. Knox. Illustrated. pp. 505.

Col. Knox's books of travel are very popular and deservedly so. He knows how to travel, what to see, and how to tell his story. These books are a delight to girls as well as boys, to adults as well as juveniles. In five volumes he has already taken his boy travelers through the Far East, including China and Japan, Siam and Java, Ceylon and India, Egypt and Palestine, and Africa; also, in one volume, through

South America. In this he gives the adventures of the same youths "in a journey in European and Asiatic Russia, with accounts of a tour across Siberia, voyages on the Amoor, Volga and other rivers, a visit to Central Asia, travels among the exiles, and a historical sketch of the empire from its foundation to the present time."

To go traveling with Knox we may expect fun and information, travel and history combined. After having made himself thoroughly familiar with the empire by three visits, following a different route each time, and by extensive reading of the best books of travel and history, he is prepared to give his reader a fascinating account of this far north country and its people so little known to the outside world. His style is direct and exceedingly agreeable, and the text is freely illustrated with excellent pictures old and new. There is also a good map. The boy that has Knox's books is rich in the best and most entertaining sort of information.

E. R. ANDREWS, ROCHESTER.

Systematic Theology. A Compendium and Commonplace-book designed for the use of Theological Students. By Augustus Hopkins Strong, D. D., President and Professor of Biblical Theology in the Rochester Theological Seminary. pp. 758. 1886.

Theological science has produced in this country very few works of the scope and merit of this solid octavo. The only previous publication of the kind that bears comparison with it is Dr. Charles Hodge's "Systematic Theology" in three volumes. While this one volume comprises as much printed matter as those three it has the advantage of smaller and, therefore, more convenient bulk, having the whole work, including a copious index of 158 pages, in a single book. It also has the merit of greater conciseness and condensation. It excels in the element of freshness. It is a comprehensive survey of modern theological opinions, exhibiting prodigious and well-digested learning, marked by an uncommon faculty of analysis, logical arrangement, and exact definition and stamped throughout by conservatism, candor and charity.

The work bears of course the impress of Baptist doctrines. Apart from the peculiarities which this community maintains on the ordinances no claim is made for a Baptist system of theology. That Baptists are Calvinists goes without saying. Still the "Five Points" receive more or less modification from the Rochester Professor. "Not the atonement but its application is limited" and Calvin is quoted as acceding to the theory of universal atonement. On election the inevitable floundering is repeated and we are told that "so ordering the universe that men *will* pursue a given course of action is a very different thing from declaring, ordering, or commanding that they *shall.*" Natural inability is moderated considerably while the tenet of final perseverance remains unqualified. For "irresistible" grace Dr. Strong prefers "efficacious," the former term implying a coercion and compulsion while the latter im-

ports that grace infallibly accomplishes its purpose of leading the sinner to the acceptance of salvation. The Formula Concordiae is quoted as sustaining this view.

The so-called "New Theology" gets no countenance in this volume. On the theory of probation after death the author gives the substance of Dorner's view and quotes the latter as antagonizing, by this demonstration of the universal relation of Christ to humanity and the absoluteness of the Christian religion, the position of Strauss that the Christian religion is not necessary to salvation because not universal, vast masses of men before and after Christ having died without being brought into relation with Christ.

It is somewhat startling to a theologian to discover that in a large volume on Systematic Theology the word sacrament occurs but a single time and that simply in a reference to the number maintained by Rome. The subject is of course treated but under the more harmless designation of ordinances, and these ordinances are nothing more than "visible signs of the saving truth of the gospel." "The Lutheran and High Church view" is stated as fairly as could be expected. Among the objections to it is the assertion that it "changes the ordinance from a sign into a means of salvation." Lutherans prefer means of salvation to empty signs. How sad that in the face of the clearest Scripture and the Church consensus for 1500 years whole denominations prefer to empty the vehicles of grace of their divine contents!

A brief quotation on the Lord's Supper is given from Gerhard. The author's familiarity with Lutheran theology appears from the large use he makes of Quenstedt, Philippi, Luthardt, Nitzsch, Thomasius and others. In fact a very attractive feature of the work is its encyclopædic character. It takes in briefly the whole field and becomes thus to all who pursue theological studies invaluable as a book of reference. It abounds not only in references to the best writers on the subjects treated but it also introduces brief quotations from them, familiarizing the reader with their general doctrinal position and stimulating him to further reading of the works themselves. Many of these quotations are followed by explanatory or critical remarks, and in the smaller print considerable space is given to notes upon matters that could not be fully treated in the text, such as the authorship of the Pentateuch, heathen trinities, the Mosaic record of creation, the evolution of man, the doctrine of election, the second coming.

Another very excellent feature is the element of scriptural exposition which is followed. Under each of the chief doctrines, the main passages relied on for proof are somewhat fully explained, and the results of the best modern exegesis are condensed into the few words of explanation immediately following many of the minor passages cited.

From a recent communication we regret to learn that the work is not to be sold at book stores, in other words, not to be offered for general

circulation. This is a great mistake. Publications of this kind are very much needed just now amid the general haze in the theological world and while this one may not solve all or many of the problems that are rife, it will help students to clear thinking and scriptural knowledge, two of the foremost requisites for a sound theology. A copy will be sent postpaid to any address on receipt of postal order for five dollars, by O. W. Jansen, 6 Trevor Hall, Rochester, N. Y.

BROBST, DIEHL & CO., ALLENTOWN, PA.

Nachrichten von den vereinigten Deutschen Evangelisch-Lutherischen Gemeinen in Nord-America.

This number completes the first volume of this superb edition of the *Hallische Nachrichten*, among the oldest and most important documents bearing on the early history of the American Lutheran Church, edited by Drs. Mann, Schmucker and Germann. With it comes a very substantial cover, in half morrocco, for the binding of the eight numbers which form Vol. I. of the series. A solid octavo of priceless historical interest has thus been added to our literature, and for the credit of the Church it is to be hoped that the work may meet with sufficient appreciation to justify the editors and publishers in carrying to completion their noble undertaking.

T. H. DIEHL, (BROBST'SCHE BUCHANDLUNG,) ALLENTOWN, PA.

Liederlust. Altes und Neues fur müntere Sänger in Kirche, Schule und Haus. Von A. Spaeth. pp. 222.

This is a very admirable collection of popular German hymns set to the music with which they are generally sung and intended for occasional use in the congregation but more especially for the family and the social circle. We know of no one in this country better qualified to make such a collection than Rev Dr. Spaeth, and our German people owe him a debt of gratitude for this kindly service. Many of the young people who can "sing German" but do not know the German alphabet, will thank him for adopting the Roman character. The author shows his appreciation of English and American hymnology by the translation of a number of our favorites, such as "Abide with Me," "Rock of Ages," "God of our Fathers," "Nearer my God to Thee," "Onward Christian Soldiers," accepting in most instances the popular airs which are uniformly associated with them. Dr. Spaeth is in this respect quite an improvement upon the compilers of a collection of English hymns for the Missourians who discarded everything in our language and used only transliterations of German chorals.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY, PHILADELPHIA.

Half-Hours with the Best American Authors. Selected and arranged by Charles Morris. Complete in four Crown octavo volumes of about 500 pages each, gilt top, cloth $6.00. 1887.

We are captivated with the idea of bringing together into a single

large collection the variegated gems of our standard American literature. The array of names kindles one's national pride, especially when we remember that they are almost exclusively the products of our country during the present century, for, with the exception of Jonathan Edwards, Benjamin Franklin and a very few others, no author of recognized merit arose among us at an earlier date. Our literature is but young, yet it vies with that of any other country during the brief period which it covers, and the best proof of such a boast is offered by this splendid selection made from our best authors. Few can indeed realize our literary wealth until they see this vast and beautiful storehouse filled with its finest and most diversified specimens.

The editor does not attempt a survey of the entire field of American literature, and he may be criticised for omitting some authors of established reputation while introducing others who are but little known to general readers—but he seems to have made the selection on the principle of the greatest good or rather the greatest enjoyment to the greatest number, and he has loyally conformed to this principle to a degree that leaves but little to be desired. Literary merit and diversity of interest have been the controlling factors rather than an author's distinction, and the character of the extracts will serve to please and instruct readers, without giving them an estimate as to the comparative standing of writers. Works of a technical character however meritorious in their particular provinces, have been avoided, and also the more solid products of philosophy, theology and the like, the aim being to make these volumes entertaining, and to familiarize the general reading public with the most popular examples of our literature in a form that would not prove laborious to read or difficult to understand.

We find such pearls as Washington's Farewell Address, Lincoln's Speech at Gettysburg, John Hay's "Little Breeches," Whittier's "Eternal Goodness," Barnes' "Life at Three-score and Ten," Krauth's "Controlling Elements of the Reformation," Noah Porter's "Books and Reading," Channing's "Relation of Religion to Literature," Mrs. Howe's "Battle Hymn of the Republic," Payne's "Home, Sweet Home," with copious extracts from our novelists, historians, humorists, scholars and miscellaneous writers.

Brief biographical notices accompany each selection and an alphabetical index of subjects and one of authors is appended. The publishers' part is in keeping with the quality of the editorial labor and altogether combine to produce a most attractive and valuable ornament to the family library.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

Alli; or Blessed are the Merciful, for they shall obtain Mercy. A Story for my young friends. By Franz Hoffman. Translated by Rev. P. C. Croll, A. M. pp. 176.

Tannenweisse; or a Happy Home. A Sequel to "Where is Heaven" by Hedwig Prohl. Translated from the German by M. P. Butcher. pp. 204.

Betty's Decision. Translated from the German of Gustav Nieritz by Mary E. Ireland. pp. 145.

Heinnerle von Lindelbronn. By Emil Frommel, D. D., Court-preacher in Berlin. Translated by Mrs. J. H. W. Stuckenberg. pp. 231.

This makes a very considerable addition to the popular "Fatherland Series," one of the best collections of Sunday School books ever published. If the Lutheran Publication House had never issued another work, the credit which accrues to it from this series entitle it to a very prominent rank among religious publishers. And if the publishers of Sunday School literature were always to show as much conscience in what they bring out, their publications would do more for the development of conscience in their readers.

The merit of these additions is in no way below the standard of former books in the series, and the last named of the above list, from the pen of the eminent Court-preacher Frommel, is destined to have a wide popularity. Books like these are sure to spread happiness and moral strength among the young.

TICKNOR & CO., BOSTON.

A Handbook of Christian Symbols and Stories of the Saints as Illustrated in Art. By Clara Erskine Clement. Edited by Katharine E. Conway. With descriptive Illustrations. pp. 349. 1886.

A work of this character meets a felt want with a large part of the reading public. Not only are those who go abroad often perplexed with the symbolic forms which are known only in some general way to represent the mysteries and facts of the Christian faith, and fairly bewildered with the numerous pictures of saints in churches and art gallaries, but the very pictures and prints which adorn our own homes are to many of us little more than mystifying puzzles. The best literature on our tables, the stories of ecclesiastical reformers and heroes, the romances founded on mediæval history, the standard poetry, not to speak of the art criticisms in our newspapers and magazines, all abound in references to quaint legends and hallowed names, of the meaning of which our ignorance is humiliating.

This volume treats first of the "Symbolism in Art" and then gives in alphabetical order the "Legends and Stories illustrated in Art." The author shows good judgment in the limits assigned each subject and has evidently exercised that careful discrimination which is required by a volume of this character. The book does of course not profess to be in all respects a true history of persons and facts. Its aim is to set before the reader in brief compass the wonderful stories of miracles and sanctity which have invested with a halo the historic personages of the

Church and to show forth the conception of them which is embodied and illustrated in art—a conception that unites both history and legend. Whether viewed as a book of information or for reference only it is to be commended as a very desirable and valuable volume. Its mechanical execution is elegant.

Genius in Sunshine and Shadow. By M. M. Ballou. pp. 309. 1887.

This volume is the result of "the gathered notes of the author's library hours." It bears this impress throughout, and, whilst interesting, is rambling and disconnected. There is displayed a wide range of reading and an intimate acquaintance with the workmanship, the peculiarities, the characteristics of authors, painters, artists and musicians. The things told are told attractively and incite the reader to secure more ample information concerning the great men of the past.

The author is not always accurate. On page 82, Mozart is represented as becoming blind at the age of forty and as the author of "Judas Maccabæus." Handel answers the description, and he is also the author of "Judas Maccabæus." Rossini's manner of composition is differently set forth on pages 73 and 82.

It would be surprising indeed if the references to so many individuals were all correct. That they are as correct as they are, speaks volumes in praise of the author's care and faithfulness. The book is a mine of information, and is, in addition, one of those charming gossipy books by which the reader in odd hours, is always interested, entertained and instructed.

THE AMERICAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY OF HEBREW, CHICAGO.

An Assyrian Manual: For the Use of Beginners in the Study of the Assyrian Language. By D. G. Lyon, Professor in Harvard University. pp. xlv., 138, large 8vo. Price $4.00. 1886.

The appearance in America of a book like this, or of the Arabic grammar of Professor Lansing by the same society, is certainly a sure sign that the Semitic studies are being vigorously prosecuted in America. Five years ago there would have been no call whatever for books of this kind. But during these years, chiefly through the influence of the American Institute of Hebrew, with Professor William R. Harper, of Yale, at its head, a revolution has been effected in this regard, and Biblical science among us has a fair outlook of being established upon a sound philological basis. The grammar before us is intended to teach beginners the elements of Assyrian, the language of the Cuneiform inscriptions of Asia. It is the language found on the old tablets and cylinders in the ruins of Babylon and Assyria, and one which has been deciphered to be closely connected as a sister tongue to the Hebrew. An extensive literature has been discovered, and much useful matter,

touching chiefly the chronology and history of the Old Testament, have been found. Next to the Hebrew it is, or probably will be, the most important Semitic dialect for the Old Testament student to study. Professor Lyon's grammar, which contains also a chrestomathy or rather selected texts, and a glossary, is admirably adapted for its purpose. It smoothes the way, as much as this can be done at the present stage of knowledge, to this remarkable language. The thorough student must have some knowledge at least of one or more of the Semitic dialects, in order intelligently to understand the Hebrew, and if his choice falls upon Assyrian he cannot do better than use Lyon's Manual.

ROBERT CARTER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

On Sale by J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia.

All of Grace. An Earnest Word with those who are seeking Salvation by the Lord Jesus Christ. By C. H. Spurgeon. pp. 128. 1886.

There is possibly no divine preacher who has greater power in reaching the heart and the conscience than the popular London preacher. The brief chapters which compose this little volume reveal the secret of this power and while the work is to be commended to all seeking salvation, it will also serve as an excellent model to those whose special office it is to direct souls that are seeking. The clear apprehension of salvation as the effect of grace, the insight into the human heart, the simplicity, pointedness and tenderness of his language, the evident sincerity of the author, combine to make him an exemplary as well as a successful winner of souls. Many of our readers will be thankful for the following extract which is a faithful specimen of the whole: "*Never make a Christ out of your faith*, nor think of it as if it were the independent source of your salvation. Our life is found in 'looking unto Jesus,' not in looking to our own faith. By faith all things become possible to us; yet the power is not in the faith, but in the God upon whom faith relies. Grace is the locomotive engine, and faith is the chain by which the carriage of the soul is attached to the great motive power. The righteousness of faith is not the moral excellence of faith, but the righteousness of Jesus Christ which faith grasps and appropriates. The peace within the soul is not derived from the contemplation of our own faith; but it comes to us from him who is our peace, the hem of whose garment faith touches, and virtue comes out of him into the soul."

The Crisis of Missions; or, the Voice out of the Cloud. By. Rev. Arthur T. Pierson, D. D. pp. 370. 1886.

This is one of the best books upon Missions that has yet appeared. It is compact; yet full of information. It gives a view of the whole field; yet avoids prolixity. It is intense in its beginning; yet well-sustained to the close. The style is clear and luminous, the illustrations

apt, the thought good. There is apparent profound faith in God, which marks His hand and presence in all the past of this work. The plan of the book is in simplicity but in strength. There is first the divine command, then, the removal of barriers, the opening of doors, as in India, Burmah, etc., then, the preparation of the Church, the results, and, the present crisis.

The author is not much in love with the New Theology and justly censures some phrases of its teaching. He possibly overstates the position it takes. His words concerning denominational comity are wise and should be carried out. A world's missionary council we heartily approve.

The weakness of the book is the tendency to over-statement of results and the ignoring of difficulties. It is rather too roseate in its views. Yet, it is better to be enthusiastic than unbelieving. The book, if read, cannot fail to do good, encourage and inspire the workers, rebuke and correct the careless and lead to more earnest effort in missions.

GEO. H. ELLIS, BOSTON.

Vexed Questions in Theology. A Series of Essays by James Freeman Clarke. pp. 249. 1886.

Among the "Vexed Questions" briefly discussed in this series of very readable essays are "The Five Points of Calvinism and the Five Points of the New Theology," "The Sin against the Holy Ghost," "Old and New Ideas concerning the Divinity of Jesus," "The Sabbath—Sunday—or the Lord's Day—which?" "Old and New Views concerning the Bible," "Agnosticism vs. Positivism," "Recent Discussions concerning Conscience and its Development."

To those who are fortified by an enlightened faith, the writings of eminent Unitarians of the culture and spirit of Dr. Clarke are likely to prove stimulating to thought and even helpful to better living. But with unlearned, unguarded or inexperienced minds such literature is sure to unsettle faith. Unless one has a strong light burning within, he cannot fail to be misled by the general haze which is the more alluring because of its glowing iridescence. The persistent misapprehension or misrepresentation of orthodox theology is simply amazing. Every page offers some gross caricature of the creed that obtains in the churches which hold no fellowship with Unitarians. It becomes easy then of course to set forth by contrast a more excellent way. We should like to see for the once a thorough treatment on the subject of sin from a leader of these Liberals, and if he should make a very serious matter of it the next thing to be waited for would be the result of his teachings on the other "vexed questions." It is very evident from a number of emphasized clauses in this volume that, in the judgment of Dr. Clarke, a preacher who on the Lord's Day so proclaims the gospel as to awaken alarm in the sinner or rouse a scourging conscience in any of his hear-

ers, is thereby breaking the Sabbath Day. "Whatever disturbs the soul with unrest is Sabbath-breaking." The zealous guardians of the "Sabbath" have their attention here called to a new form of Sabbath desecration. Let them look out for Moody and others who break the rest of sinners by preaching.

The Fourth Gospel. The question of its origin stated and discussed by James Freeman Clarke. pp. 70. 1886.

This is quite a small volume but one of inestimable merit. It carefully reviews the principal arguments against the Johannine origin of the Gospel and reaches "the belief that no historic fact of authorship stands on a firmer basis than this, and that the long-received opinion of the Christian Church is not likely to be essentially altered." This is the conclusion, be it remembered, of a distinguished scholar who does not allow himself to be bound either by hoary traditions or by orthodox creeds. The little work is written in popular style and commends itself to the unlearned as well as to scholars.

FUNK & WAGNALLS, NEW YORK.

Commentary on the Gospel of John. With an Historical and critical Introduction by F. Godet, Doctor in Theology and Professor in the Faculty of the Independent Church of Neuchatel. Vol. II. Translated from the third French edition, with a Preface, Introductory suggestions, and additional notes by Timothy Dwight, President of Yale College. pp. 551. 1886.

It is gratifying to have the second volume of Godet follow so soon upon the first. This house is generally on time and keeps its promises made to the public. We now have this great work complete. While there are three volumes of the original the American translation is issued in two. As was said in these columns before (Vol. XVI. 460), they form an able and valuable addition to the study of the Fourth Gospel. Dr. Dwight's additional notes, which occupy nearly 100 pages, will be found among the most excellent features of the work, and Godet's comments themselves are made more valuable by this careful editorial supervision with which they are supplemented.

ANSON D. F. RANDOLPH & CO., NEW YORK.

On sale by J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia.

Stepping Heavenward. By Mrs. E. Prentiss, Author of the "Flower of the Family," the "Susy Books," etc., etc. New Stereotype edition, with a sketch of the author. pp. 426.

"Stepping Heavenward" ranks among the classics of our religious literature. It was first published in book form in 1869, and at once attracted wide attention, No less than five different houses republished it in England. It has been translated into the French, German, Norwegian, and Swedish languages. More than 75,000 copies have been sold in the

United States, while the sales in Great Britain, on the Continent, in Canada and Australia have been very large. Yet the the demand continues unabated and the publishers have gotten out this cheaper edition in response to many requests so as to put it within the reach of every class of readers. It is a book that touches the popular chord, glows with human sympathy, gives energy to faith and the most helpful counsel to those who experience perplexity and discouragement in their attempts at 'stepping heavenward.' No Sunday School or Christian family should fail to have a copy of it.

A Year of Blessings, and a Blessed Year. Compiled by Rose Porter, author of "Summer Driftwood," "Winter Fire," etc. pp. 191.

Good taste and healthy religious sentiment mark the selections which are here compiled from Scripture and well-known religious writers, an inspired and an uninspired passage being set to each day of the year. Many of our modern standard authors are quoted as well as those who are classics in the devotional literature of the past. The little volume is handsomely gotten out, and, if used as a spiritual *vade mecum*, will help much to make "a blessed year" to all who shall possess it.

The Difficulties of the Soul; or Hindrances to Believing. By W. Hay M. H. Aitken, M. A., late incumbent of Christ Church, Everton. Author of "The School of Grace," "What is Your Life," etc. pp. 188.

Mr. Aitken is the English Evangelist who conducted the series of meetings which were held with so much apparent success a year ago in several Episcopal churches of New York city. He seems possessed of rare gifts for the treatment of the awakened, and has a practical insight into the real as well as the feigned hindrances which are so common to religious experience. Pastors would do well to study works of this character, keeping, however, a careful watch, that while they learn effective methods and plans they be not moved from the simplicity that is in Christ.

From the Crib to the Cross. A Life of our Lord, written for the Little Ones. By Mrs. Edward Ashley Walker, author of "The Two Heaps," etc.

This is the third of the series of "Bible Stories for the Little Ones." With the necessary exception of proper names and the four terms "baptize," "Father," "Jesus," and Holy Ghost," the whole is written in monosyllables. In examining it one is touchingly reminded of the admonition, "Suffer the little children to come unto me." The language of the Bible is adhered to as closely as possible, and the sacredness which attaches to scripture phraseology is thus largely preserved.

Uniform with the above in binding, type, and simplicity of language, the same publishers issue *The Pilgrim's Progress.* For the Little Ones. By Mrs. Edward Ashley Walker, author of "The Two Heaps," "A Lit-

tle Leaven," etc. The old favorite allegory is thus made intelligible to the very youngest mind, and there is a fitness in having the other three volumes containing Holy Writ, followed by this charming exhibition of the Christian's progress from the City of Destruction to the Heavenly City. We can think of no more precious gift to childhood just beginning to read than these four volumes which put in a case make a beautiful object to the eye, while their contents must fascinate the simple mind of infancy.

SCHAEFFER & KORADI, PHILADELPHIA.

Die Werke des Flavius Josephus, des berühmten Jüdischen Geschichtschreiber. Enthaltened: Zwanzig Bücher von der alten Jüdischen Geschichte; Sieben Bücher vom Kriege der Juden mit den Römern; Zwei Bücher von dem alten Herkommen der Juden wider Apion; Ein Buch von dem Märtyrertode der Maccabäer, und das Leben des Josephus von ihm selbst geschrieben. Alles aus dem Griechischen Originale übersetzt durch Professor J. F. Cotta und Professor A. Fr. Gfrörer. Das Zanze von neuem nach dem Griechischen bearbeitet; mit erklärenden Aumerkungen von Rosenmüller, Burder, Michaelis, Whiston, Jost, Funk u. A. begleitet; und mit den nöthigen Tabellen und Registern vorsehen durch C. R. Demme, Prediger der Deutsch-Lutherischen Zion's und St. Michaelis Gemeinde in Philadelphia. Neue (Siebente) Auflage. pp. 903.

We hail with satisfaction the appearance of the seventh edition of this admirable work. It was indeed a great venture when the enterprising firm of Kimber & Sharpless in 1838 undertook to issue a German edition of Josephus, a ponderous quarto of over nine hundred pages, with costly maps and many steel engravings. Could it be expected that such an expensive standard work would find a remunerative sale? Was there in our country a German reading public prepared to welcome and appreciate it? Such questions found their answer in the demand for one edition after another, until now the seventh is issued by the firm of Schaeffer & Koradi. It is certainly creditable to our German reading public that a work of this character has found such ready sale and is still in demand.

It is issued in numbers, at fifteen cents each, thirty of which will complete the volume. Or the entire work, in strong leather binding, with clasps, is offered at $6.50. We miss, indeed in this edition, the illustrations that accompanied the first, the fanciful portrait of Josephus, the imaginary representations of Old Testament incidents, drawn by R. Westall, of the Royal Academy, and engraved on steel by Heath, Steel, Tanner and others. These, while enhancing the cost of the original edition, added but little to its intrinsic value, and can readily be dispensed with. But a careful comparison of this edition with a very handsome copy of the first, presented by Kimber & Sharpless to the Lutheran Historical Society, proves that the stereotype plates, cast by

John Fagan, of Philadelphia, must have been handled with the greatest care. The letter press, both in the heavier style of the text and the lighter forms employed in the voluminous and valued notes, is remarkably clear and distinct, a real treat for the eyes.

The admirable preface by the American editor, Rev. Dr. C. R. Demme, and the very full and satisfactory index, prepared by his colleague at Zion's and St. Michael's church in Philadelphia, Rev. G. A. Reichert, give great additional value to the work.

We cordially echo the endorsement given to this splendid publication at its first appearance by the *Lutheran Observer* in its issue of September 9th, 1839: "This work is now before us, and may be commended as a proud specimen of German bookmaking in this country; we doubt whether anything equal to it has ever yet proceeded from the German press in America. * * The preparation of this work for the press must have been a laborious and tedious task, and we almost wonder how the learned editor could summon up sufficient courage to undertake it. Now, however, that the task is accomplished—and so well accomplished—we hope the enterprising publishers may be richly rewarded by a prompt and liberal sale of the book." C. A. H.

The same house has sent us the first number of *Palestina in Bild u. Wort*, published by the *Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt*, Stuttgart. A magnificent work of art which has commanded the favorable judgment of the highest art and literary criticism in Germany, and which is not surpassed by anything of the kind in England or America. It is the joint product of such masters as Georg Ebers and Hermann Guthe. The present cheap edition will appear in 84 numbers, in elegant covers, each number consisting of 12 folio pages, the whole containing more than 1000 pages, over 500 wood cuts, 2 frontispieces in steel, 2 maps, and a plan of Jerusalem. It is a superb delineation by pen and pencil of the Holy Land, and offered at rates that put it within the reach of all classes of intelligent Christians.

LEE & SHEPARD, BOSTON. CHARLES T. DILLINGHAM, NEW YORK.

Young People's History of England. By George Makepeace Towle, Author of "History of Henry V.," "Heroes of History," "Modern Greece," "Modern France," etc., etc. pp. 388. 1886.

Mr. Towle always writes like one thoroughly familiar with his subject and intent on giving in rapid, lucid and pleasing sketches all the information of which the scope of a volume will admit. The work before us presents the main facts in English history from the Roman conquest to the present day and will afford to both juvenile and adult readers a fascinating story and a faithful impression of the salient events and the famous characters that have marked the steady development of the political liberties and institutions of England.

The numerous illustrations enhance the value of the book and a series

of chapters on the "Progress of the People," the changes in their social condition and their successive advances in literature and art form a very interesting and important feature. There is also an appendix of "Chronological Annals" a list of the sovereigns of England and one of Prime Ministers since the accession of Walpole.

Stem to Stern, or Building the Boat. By Oliver Optic, Author of "Young America Abroad," "The Great Western Series," etc., etc. With Illustrations. pp. 324.

This is the fourth volume of the "Boat Builder Series." Most of the characters connected with the Beech Hill Industrial School, near Lake Champlain, continue to take part in the action of the story. As in former volumes the author has endeavored to interest his young readers in mechanical industry and to cultivate in them respect for manual labor. The hero is a poor boy with a true heart and manly spirit, knowing to defend his own rights and fight his own battles as well as to shield those whom misfortune placed under his protection.

The Book of Eloquence: A Collection of Extracts in Prose and Verse, from the most famous Orators and Poets. Intended as Exercises for Declamation in Colleges and Schools. By Charles Dudley Warner. pp. 452.

To pupils in our public schools, academies, and the lower classes of our colleges, this book will be highly acceptable. The extracts are made with much discrimination, and with such an eye to the spirited that the young will naturally take to them. Many of them, too, are new, Mr. Warner having made it a special aim to discard the old and hackneyed, retaining of the old only those that will never grow old. He has made his selections from American authors which he puts into one class; from European orators, ancient and modern, which he puts into another; and makes a third class of poetical selections, gathered from all sources. We are sorry to see that pulpit oratory is almost entirely discarded. That is a mine from which he might have gathered some choice gems. Perhaps, however, Mr. Warner's reading does not run much in the line of sermons. But notwithstanding this omission the book is an excellent one of its kind.

The Little Master. By J. T. Trowbridge. Illustrated. pp. 230.

This is a story of a boy of eighteen years teaching a country school, in which were boys older than himself and some of them hard to manage. His tact in emergencies and his success are well portrayed in the incidents related, and will likely recall some of his own experiences to every one who taught a "district school" when young. Any one who has ever been a country school-boy or teacher will enjoy this story. It is all the more true to life because founded on fact. The principal disturber of the peace of the school, we are told, "is now a haughty and

domineering politician, disliked even by his own followers, and tolerated only for his unscrupulous services to his party." And the story closes as follows: "Chauncey Mayhew [the teacher] is now a distinguished educator and scholar. I made his acquaintance a few summers ago at a seaside resort, where we sat one moonlight evening until a late hour on the wave-washed rocks, and he gave me the outlines of this story."

FLEMING & REVELL, CHICAGO AND NEW YORK.

D. L. Moody at Home. His Home and Home Work: Embracing a description of the Educational Institutions there established, together with some account of the various Christian Conferences, and the best thoughts therein exchanged, Helpful Hints and Practical Points. Illustrated. pp. 288.

Mr. Moody has become one of the notable men of the age. An Evangelist whose strong and spotless character, transparent simplicity and unquestioned success, have done much to break down the strong and well-grounded prejudices against so-called evangelistic measures. Mr. Moody is a personality concerning whom the Christian public will never tire of hearing. The educational institutions which he has succeeded in establishing at Northfield and at Mt. Hermon, are probably the greatest movements of his wonderful career, and a large portion of this volume is devoted to their history and description. In the reports of papers reads and addresses, others figure more largely than Mr. Moody, and some of them, doubtless, go beyond his acknowledged conservatism. It is not Mr. Moody, but one of his confreres, who declares that at the Second Coming Jerusalem shall be rebuilt and Christ their Messiah recognized by the Jews. The distinguished and humble-minded servant of the Lord may, for various reasons, be classified with those who ought to pray for deliverance from their friends. When the author of this book speaks of the addresses and discussions which constitute a large part of it as being originally "indited by the Holy Spirit," some of us are disposed to inquire whether Mr. Moody was purposely "kept without knowledge thereof," as is claimed for the contents of the first two chapters, or whether he really affects inspiration. The little volume is worthy of a careful and discriminating perusal.

Many Infallible Proofs. A Series of Chapters on the Evidences of Christianity; or, The Written and Living Word of God. By Arthur T. Pierson, D. D. pp. 317.

A man is wonderfully helped in giving light along the way, if he has already trodden that way himself, and knows the places most dangerous and full of pitfalls. He throws the strongest light where the pathway is darkest and narrowest—just where it is most needed. In "A Word Preliminary" the author of this work says: "The writer of these pages

once found himself getting into the deep darkness of doubt. Beginning at the foundation, he searched for himself until he found the proofs ample that the Bible is the word of God. It was like finding one's way out of a dense wood into the full light of day. Others are still in the dark; and these chapters are the blazed trees that mark the path by which one man got out of the forest. Perhaps some one else may try the same route with a like result."

After an introductory chapter on "Weighing the Proof," the work is divided into two parts, the first treating of "The Volume of the Book" and the second of "The Divine Person." Seven chapters are devoted to the first part and six to the second. Ample attention is given to prophecy, miracles, the scientific accuracy and proof of God's word, its moral beauty and sublimity, the person of Christ, and the originality and power of his teaching. The chapter on the possibility and probability of miracles is specially strong, and that on Christ as a divine teacher is delightful reading. Dr. Pierson is happy and striking in his illustrations, and they abound, adding much life to subjects that are apt to grow dull in the unfolding of the argument. As a contribution to Christian Evidences it deserves a hearty welcome. It is fully up to the times.

ROBERT CLARKE & CO., CINCINNATI.

For Sale by the J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia.

Spinoza and His Environment. A Critical Essay, with a Translation of the Ethics. By Henry Smith, D. D., LL. D., Late Professor in Lane Theological Seminary. pp. clxxix. and 244. 1886.

This valuable work is the result of lectures to the students in Lane Theological Seminary. The matter has been recast for publication, and appears as "a contribution toward a solution of the causes of modern doubt." It forms an examination of the course of philosophy for the last three centuries, with the specific view of showing the place and influence of Spinoza and connecting that influence with the religious skepticism that marks our time.

The examination begins with Bacon, and traces the revolution wrought when his Novum Organum terminated the long ascendency of the Aristotelian dialectic by establishing the inductive system of investigating truth. The inductive method is explained and illustrated, and the misleading influences against which philosophic science must guard are pointed out under Bacon's well-known classification of their sources, as "idols of the tribe, idols of the den, idols of the market, and idols of the theatre." The account of Bacon is followed by an account of Descartes' personality and system, showing how, starting with the principle of doubting everything till proved, and finding his first firm ground in the reality of self-existence through the formula, *cogito, ergo sum*, he established a method the very opposite of the Baconian observation and induction, and rested all true knowledge of existence on *a priori* data.

The merits of Descartes are recognized as very great, and his methods are not here examined with a view to criticism, but simply to determine its relation to the method of Bacon and to discover in both some of the determining facts in the environment of Spinoza. The history of Spinoza, as a disciple of Descartes, is then sketched, followed by an analysis of his *Ethics* and an account of his pantheistic philosophy. The relation of succeeding philosophers, especially to Spinoza's *a priori* method of dealing with the question of the divine existence, is traced through Kant, Coleridge, Sir W. Hamilton and others. This prepares the way for our author to find, as one of the misleading influences of our times, what he terms "rehabilitated and Christianized Spinozism." The result has come through a degeneration according to the peculiar drift or tendency of the Cartesian method. "The drift of the Baconian philosophy has been in the direction of materialism, with a degeneration into materialistic atheism.' 'The drift of the Cartesian philosophy has been in the direction of idealism, with a degeneration often into virtual atheism, by the substitution of a mere conception for the really existing unity.' This degeneration took place in Spinoza's pantheistic system, in which God becomes impersonal and lost in the cosmos. The perverting force of this idea, our author traces in English theology and Emersonian thought in America, and concludes with the judgment that "Spinozism is not dead," and that "it is the taproot of modern doubt."

Dr. Smith's work exhibits throughout familiar acquaintance with the history of modern philosophy, and fine powers of analysis and construction. The problem it discusses is an exceedingly difficult one—the source of the skepticism of our day. For the present current of doubt is one in which scores of tributary streams have converged and mixed. Perhaps it is not amiss to classify these streams, as our author has done, in the two great divisions determined by the Baconian method and the Cartesian method, and while crediting empiricism with the tendency to materialistic atheism, to attribute to idealism all the shifting and disturbing notions by which transcendental teaching is transforming spiritual verities into conceptions and thought without substance and reality.

But Dr. Smith sometimes slips and makes untenable assertions, as when on p. lvii. he says: "There is absolutely no such thing as the human will. The word is nothing but a generalization indicating modes of the mind's *action*." Does he accept the absurd psychology which treats the soul, not as a spiritual entity with powers of action, but as only a series of *acts?* On p. cxxxii. he represents the popular answer of Greece, at the opening of the Christian era, to the question of the existence of a personal, omniscient, almighty and just God, to have been given on the Athenian altar: Ἀγνώστῳ Θεῷ—"to the unknowable God." Dr. Smith can hardly seriously mean that ἀγνώστος is rightly translated by "unknowable," or that the inscription, under the circumstances in which it had its origin, was the recorded judgment of the

people of the ancient world, pronouncing "the problem" of the divine existence "insoluble." Such straining of a Scripture fact is not to be commended.

More than half the volume is composed of the translation of Spinoza's Ethics. The exceeding difficult task of translation seems to have been well done, and the volume will furnish English readers with an opportunity of studying, for themselves, the system of the famous philosopher of modern pantheism. M. V.

Ham-Mishkan, The Wonderful Tent. An Account of the Structure, Signification, and Spiritual Lessons of the Mosaic Tabernacle erected in the Wilderness of Sinai. By Rev. D. A. Randall, D. D., Author of the "Handwriting of God in Egypt, Sinai, and the Holy Land." With a Portrait of the Author. pp. 420. 1886.

Dr. Randall made for himself a wide reputation by his work some years ago, entitled "The Handwriting of God in Egypt, Sinai, and the Holy Land"—two volumes based on the data obtained in his travels and investigations in these countries. The new work now before us is, in part, the fruit of the same travels and inquiries, and in the line of the author's favorite employment of explaining and illustrating the word of God and the history of His people. It was completed just before his death in 1883.

The purpose of the volume—to present a complete conception of the Hebrew Tabernacle, its history and relation to the faith and religion of the Jews, the method and form of its structure, the symbolism and spiritual significance of its various parts and appointments, the manifold lessons the entire structure and its services were intended to teach in the Old Dispensation and foretell in the New—this purpose has been accomplished, not in the ordinary way of didactic statement, but by using the forms of the traveler's narration of a party of inquirers on the scene of the original building. The journey proceeds from Suez, through the wilderness, and the party, consisting of a Christian, a learned Rabbi, and other biblical scholars, encamp at the foot of Sinai. In imagination the Tabernacle is rebuilt and studied. The author thus gives the subject the variety, freshness and vividness of explanation and presentation peculiar to the narrative and conversational method.

The work pleases us very much. It is not intended for the critical scholar who has at hand all the sources of biblical investigation and knowledge, but for the general Christian reader. If we mistake not, however, clergymen, theological students as well as Sunday-School teachers and the ordinary reader, will find this volume full of valuable information and suggestion. M. V.

S. C. GRIGGS & CO., CHICAGO.

Complete Poetical Works of Benjamin F. Taylor. pp. 355.

These poems cover a wide range of subjects and many of them pos-

sess great merit. It would be expecting too much to look for the highest excellence in all the poems contained in a book of the size of this one. It seem to us that the author is most happy in those written on Country Life, and on Nature. In many of these there is a quaintness, an earnestness and depth of feeling, and grace of expression that at once arrest and hold the interest, and compel the sympathy of the reader. Scattered all through the volume are many beautiful thoughts strikingly put. Many of the poems reveal the author's sincere Christian faith and earnestness. In the front of the book is to be seen a likeness of Mr. Taylor, showing him to have a rugged and strong, though kindly face.

As is always the case with this house, the publishers have done their work well, sending forth a volume in every way attractive. M. V.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO., BOSTON AND NEW YORK.

Beckonings for Every Day. A Calendar of Thought arranged by Lucy Larcom. pp. 225. 1886.

These selections are made from the best authors. At least two quotations, one of prose and one of poetry, are appropriated to each day of the year, among them some of the most awakening and inspiring words of the great and good in all ages. A certain order is followed by assigning for instance to January the theme of "The Invisible Presence," to February "Our Work," to March "Our Neighbor," &c., &c. It is a precious little volume and will be appreciated by any refined and serious mind.

Holy-Tides: Seven Songs of Advent, Christmas, Epiphany, Lent, Easter, Whitsuntide, Trinity. Parchment paper covers.

Mrs. A. D. T. Whitney's Seven Sacred Songs for the Church's Sacred Seasons are exquisite gems of spiritual poetry and are brought out by the publishers in a form of delicate beauty. The little collection will make an appropriate present upon any of the Festivals which constitute its subjects.

Orient. With Preludes on Current Events. By Joseph Cook. pp. 340. 1886.

This volume contains Mr. Cook's Boston Monday Lectures in the winter after his return from his tour of the world. That tour was without a parallel in the labors of investigation and public lecturing which marked its whole course. Handling the leading questions in debate between Christianity and philosophy, as well as the questions raised by the progress of science, he was greeted by immense audiences in all the great cities visited. It was a brilliant success.

The Boston Monday lectures after his return naturally give out the rich treasures of information and thought gained during the more than two years' travel, especially in oriental lands. Among the salient

points here found are discussions of the character and career of Keshub Chunder Sen and of the contributions of the Brahmo Somaj of India to the science of Comparative Philology; of the origin and possible future of recent reforms in Japan; descriptions of Palestine, the Taj Mahal, the Himalayas, China, and the Southern Pacific Ocean; the achievements and probable future of civilization in Australasia; and the international duties of Christendom and the prospects of Imperial Federation in the British Empire. These subject are treated with the boldness, brilliancy, and wealth of information and illustration known as characterizing Mr. Cook's discussions.

Other topics, treated of in the Preludes, are National Aid to Education, Revivals True and False, Limited Municipal Suffrage for Women, Religion in Colleges at Home and Abroad, and Foreign Criticism of America.

It is not surprising that these volumes of the Monday Lectures find ready sale and many of them are called for in numerous successive editions. The present volume is specially valuable to those who wish to be informed as to the progress of thought in the distant lands of the East. M. V.

Ancient Cities, From the Dawn to the Daylight. By William Burnet Wright, Pastor of the Berkley Street Church, Boston. pp. 291. $1.25.

The design of this work is to give a brief sketch of the most prominent cities that are in some way connected with the history of the work of human redemption, either in its preparatory stages, under the old dispensation, or in Christ's day, when the fullness of time was come.

"The cities in which I have tried to interest the reader," says the author, "were so connected with the experiences of the chosen people that an acquaintance with any one of them can scarcely fail of throwing light upon some portion of the Bible. Each city, as the reader will perceive, has also been selected either because its history appears to illustrate pointedly some utterance of Christ, or because the manner in which it aided in preparing for the 'New Jerusalem' is obvious."

Starting with a sketch of "Ur, the City of the Saints," the reader is presented with the salient facts, bearing on the work of redemption, in the history of all the great cities of the world-empires of the East, and of Athens and Rome in the West. The chapters on the two latter are worthy of special mention—the story of Athens being exceedingly vivid. Free from all extravagances, the author has grasped the most outstanding facts, and presented them with such picturesqueness and power as to give the reader a clear perception of the wonders of the ancient seat of culture and learning. The last chapter on the "New Jerusalem, the King," is a masterly portrayal of the spread of Christ's kingdom on earth—in many passages rising into real eloquence. The illustrations

in this chapter are chosen with rare felicity and discrimination, powerfully setting forth the progress in the conquest of the world to Christ.

The style of the work throughout is chaste and dignified, thoroughly harmonizing with the character of the subjects treated. To read the volume has afforded unmingled pleasure. The publishers have not neglected their part, the dress of the book being worthy of its contents.

M. V.

The Great Debate. A Verbatim Report of the Discussion at the Meeting of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, held at Des Moines, Iowa, Thursday, October 7, 1886. pp. 86.

Those who desire to understand the questions involved in the relations of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to the "New Theology," especially on the point of a future probation for the heathen, will find nothing better for the purpose than this neatly printed pamphlet. In addition to the speeches, it gives the necessary statements, reports, &c., to show the connection in which the subject came before the Board.

M. V.

Roland Blake. By. S. Weir Mitchell, M. D., Author of "Hepzibah Guiness," "In War Time," "The Hill of Stones and Other Poems." pp. 379.

It is surprising that a man of Dr. Mitchell's reputation as a physician, with his time overcrowded with professional duties, should be able to give so much attention to literary work. A diversion it may be, but how does he find time for so much of it? His latest is a novel, "Roland Blake," now under review, a story associated with the period of our civil war and containing a few war incidents, but not enough to make it a war story. The conspicuous feature of it, as it appears to us, is the contrast of the noble character of the Northern soldier, Roland Blake, with the narrowness and mean spirit mingled with the haughtiness and pride of Richard Darnell, a representative of the aristocratic Virginians and a soldier in the Confederate army. We take it that Dr. M. has not much admiration for the "F. F. V's" nor very marked conciliatory feelings towards the South. Other characters, as well as the two we have just named, are well sustained, but the story as a whole is rather tame. It is likely that the author will never attain the reputation as a novelist that he now has as a physician.

Applied Christianity. Moral Aspects of Social Questions. By Washington Gladden. pp. 320.

This book contains nine papers on the following subjects: "Christianity and Wealth," "Is Labor a Commodity?" "The Strength and Weakness of Socialism," "Is it Peace or War?" "The Wage-Workers and the Churches," "Three Dangers," "Christianity and Social Science," "Christianity and Popular Amusements," "Christianity and Pop-

ular Education." These are timely and living questions discussed from an intelligent, Christian view-point. Would that the principles here set forth could have a wide reading. Though we may take exception here and there to minor points, we regard them as eminently judicious and safe. They represent the most enlightened Christian thought of to-day on the subjects presented.

Thirteen Weeks of Prayer for the Family. Compiled from many sources. By Benjamin B. Comegys, author of "An Order of Worship," "Services for the Chapel," etc. pp. 216.

Family Prayers are neglected by many Christians, not from any disinclination to have them, or because they are considered of little importance, but because the head of the family feels that he cannot lead the devotions with any "comfort to himself or edification to others." This book is intended for such—for those who feel a special embarrassment in extempore prayer. For expressing the common wants of the human heart, for a spirit of earnest devotion, for scripturalness, and for adaptation to the needs of the family, these prayers are to be highly commended. Covering, as they do, every morning and evening for thirteen weeks, and each one giving opportunity at a designated place for special extemporaneous petitions, they lack nothing for all ordinary occasions. Nor are particular occasions overlooked, as there are prayers for New Year's Day, Good Friday, Easter, Christmas, Fourth of July, Communion Day, for the sick, the bereaved, the absent, etc., etc. The only omission we regret is the absence of short prayers at meals. A page of these, presenting variety as well as appropriateness, not necessarily to be used in form, but for suggestion, would add something to the completeness and excellence of this excellent book.

Ten Dollars Enough: Keeping House well on Ten Dollars a Week; how it has been done; how it may be done again. By Catharine Owen. pp. 279.

Here is something of decided value to those who wish to enjoy what may be fairly called good living and yet observe culinary economy. In the form of a story we are told how the table may be supplied for the family at the rate of ten dollars a week. Bills of fare are presented which ought to satisfy any reasonable appetite or palate, and the articles are estimated at New York prices, *in season*, and hence ought to meet the case almost anywhere else. Of course skill is required in using up the scraps. "Ten Dollars Enough" will allow no waste. The contents appeared first in *Good Housekeeping*, and were published as a book at the suggestion of the editor of that magazine. The story, *as a story*, has much interest, and the practical suggestions will save many a dollar to every housekeeper that judiciously follows them.

A. C. ARMSTRONG & SON, 714 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.
For Sale by the J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia.

The Parables of our Saviour. Expounded and Illustrated. By William M. Taylor, D. D., LL. D., Pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York City. pp. 445.

Dr. Taylor has already compassed a wide range of biblical truth in his books, and his prolific pen is still at work. The remarkable thing about his many published sermons is that he repeats himself so little and is in all so fresh and forceful. We miss the presence of the living speaker, and in Dr. Taylor's case that is much; but his sermons are exceptionally attractive and holding nevertheless. They are anything but tiresome reading, and it is no wonder that some of them have reached beyond the first edition. They are in demand and deserve to be.

This series on the parables of our Lord is second to none from his pen. They are clear and direct in style, abound in apt illustrations, are textually faithful, and breathe a devout and scholarly spirit. They are of a more popular cast than the expositions of Archbishop Trench, but there is no true scholarship sacrificed in order to give them this character. There is a plain and happy way of putting scholarly things, and this we conceive to be no minor part of the author's secret of power. In pointed application, too, these sermons are excellent and, under God's blessing, will accomplish what the author, in his preface, prays they may be used for, viz., the glory of God's name, the edification of his Church, and the conversion of men. His catholicity of spirit is also commendable. While a consistent denominationalist, he is above all a Christian, and says himself: "I have an utter abhorence of that system which refuses to help those who cannot pronounce 'shibboleth' as we do," (p. 234 on Parable of the Good Samaritan).

The Dragon, Image, and Demon, or the Three Religions of China—Confucianism, Buddhism, and Taoism—giving an account of the Mythology, Idolatry, and Demonolatry of the Chinese. By Rev. Hampden C. DuBose, Fourteen Years a Missionary at Soochow. pp. 468.

This volume has grown out of a lecture on "The Three Religions" delivered in many churches of the United States during a visit here in 1882. Having been a missionary so many years he writes largely from personal study and observation. The full title-page gives the drift of the work very well. In his preface he explains the choice of title: "The name chosen is the most exact representation that could be found of what each system is. The 'Dragon' is the emblem of China and its State Church; the 'Image' is a synonym for the Indian religion—it matters little the size, color, or name of the image; and the term 'Demon' is Taoism in a nut-shell." Further on (p. 32) he speaks more fully and explicitly: "Confucianism is based on morality, Buddhism on Idolatry,

and Taoism on superstition. The first is man-worship, the second image-worship, and the third spirit-worship. From another point of view the orthodox faith is characterized by an absence of worship, the Indian faith by the worship of the seen, and the native faith by the fear of the unseen. Confucianism deals more with the dead past, Buddhism with the changing future, while Taoism is occupied with the evils of the present." A combination of these make up the complex Chinese religion. The book is richly illustrated, well printed, and attractively bound. We commend it as a clear and popular presentation of the subject about which such vague views prevail.

Anecdotes Illustrative of Old Testament Texts. pp. 332.

A good sermon often lacks interest and comes short of effective force from lack of illustration. An ordinary sermon, on the other hand, is often rendered very interesting and effective if aptly illustrated; hence the value of having at hand what will suitably serve one's purpose in this respect. Here we have a book of several hundred pages full of anecdotes under special texts in the Old Testament—some of them very pointed and appropriate, others lacking these features. As a whole, they are fresh and will prove very helpful. The application of many need not be confined to the special texts under which they are given, but may be called on for service elsewhere, if done with discriminating judgment. The volume belongs to "The Clerical Library" issued by this enterprising house.

AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

Notes of Sermons. By J. M. Pendleton, D. D. pp. 227.

We venture to say that no man will prepare as good a sermon with an outline furnished by another as he will with one of his own, although his may be adjudged quite inferior. Only the mind that makes the outline can satisfactorily fill it out. If another attempts to run in its groove it will be all the while at a disadvantage and in the outcome have an inferior result. We take it that "homiletical helps," whether as periodicals or books, are not helpful if taken any other way than *suggestively.* They must inevitably weaken self-reliance for one thing, and for another lead to confusion in developing the line of thought. Hence we are slow to recommend anything of this kind. They may be harmless if used merely by way of suggestion in developing other themes, but generally they are not so used but rather in servile dependence upon them in writing on the author's subjects. If, however, we were to recommend any, these "notes" by Dr. Pendleton should have the preference. His outlines are natural and lead to a legitimate treatment of his themes. Some of them are the mere "heads" of the discourse; others are more full. There are seventy-five of them, covering a wide range of subjects—a few of them having a distinctively Baptist ring, as might naturally be expected.

THOMAS WHITTAKER, 2 AND 3 BIBLE HOUSE, NEW YORK.

The Life of Christ in the World. Sermons by the Rev. Arthur Brooks, Rector of the Church of the Incarnation, New York. pp. 360.

These sermons are not conspicuous for their rhetorical finish or for their strict homiletical arrangement, but they are, nevertheless, characterized by decided merits. They are marked by a directness, a Christ-like spirit, a practical bearing on faith and life that far transcend any mere graces of rhetoric or rules of homiletics. We must not be understood to mean that they are lacking these—they simply do not strike the reader as among the leading merits. If we were to name any of the sermons that please us specially, we would mention the third on "The Power of Christ's Words," the eighth on "The Sifting of Life," and the nineteenth, "A Christmas Sermon." In all there are twenty-five, covering the main events of Christ's life from birth to his ascension and the chief and vital features of the Christian life. In style of writing they show, as they ought to, that they were prepared for delivery, and hence have more warmth and vivacity than if prepared to appear merely in cold type. They are comprehensive in scope of subjects and unobjectionable, so far as we have noticed, in doctrine.

WARNER, BEERS & CO., CHICAGO.

History of Cumberland and Adams Counties, Pennsylvania. Containing History of the Counties, their Townships, Towns, Villages, Schools, Churches, Industries, etc.; Portraits of Early Settlers and Prominent Men; Biographies; History of Pennsylvania, Statistical and Miscellaneous Matter, etc., etc. Illustrated. pp. 586, 516. 1886.

This is a very large and weighty volume and is substantially and handsomely bound. It gives a vast amount of information, much of which will be entirely new to most of readers. There is a flavor of freshness in the style and contents which will make the reading of it a fascinating pastime to the present and former residents of the two counties. To the latter such a book treating of their native heath and its successive occupants would be especially desirable. We are disappointed that greater pains were not taken to secure accuracy on subjects of general historical interest. Works of this character ought to become standards in the sphere of local history. The biographical sketches may be assumed to be quite reliable since the authors of them were thoroughly familiar with their respective subjects.

CONCORDIA-VERLAG (M. C. BARTHEL, AGENT), ST. LOUIS, MO.

Amerikanischer Kalendar für Deutsche Lutheraner auf das Jahr 1887.

Register Zum "Lutheraner." Jahrgang 1–40.

Synodal-Bericht. Proceedings of the Minnesota and Dakota District of the Synod of Missouri, &c. A. D. 1886.

Synodal-Bericht. Proceedings of the Michigan District of the Synod of Missouri, &c. A. D. 1886.

Synodal-Bericht. Proceedings of the Eastern District of the Synod of Missouri, &c. A. D. 1886.

Stall's Lutheran Year Book and Historical Quarterly. Containing an Almanac, Calendars, and Daily Readings, for the year of our Lord, 1887. Edited and published by Rev. Sylvanus Stall, A. M., Lancaster, Pa., author of "How to Pay Church Debts," etc. pp. 186. For sale by all Lutheran Publication Houses and Bookstores in the United States.

To tell the readers of the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY at this date the merits of Stall's Year Book would be carrying coals to Newcastle. There is probably not one who is without a copy of a work that has become indispensable to all who appreciate full information concerning the Lutheran Church. It is not free from imperfections, but every year's issue is a great advance on the previous one.

The Lutheran Almanac and Year Book published by the Lutheran Publication Society, 42 North Ninth St., Philadelphia, maintains its high standard for accurate statistics and excellent selections of reading matter.

The Sentence and its Parts. An Analytic Syntax for the use of advanced classes of schools, and for self-instruction. By Geo. W. Ebeling, Ph. D., Principal of Oberlea Home School for Boys at Catonsville, Md. pp. 64. Sold by the author. A very modest maiden effort, but so successful that it is hoped it is but the precursor of literary work on a larger scale.

☞Books that will receive notice in the next issue:

The Miraculous Element in the Gospels. By Alexander Balmain Bruce, D. D. A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York.

Luther's Small Catechism, Explained and Amplified for use in Classes, Schools and Families, Together with Tables of Duties, &c., and the Lutheran Doctrine of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. pp. 150. Published for the author by the Luth. Pub. Society, Philadelphia. A symposium on this Catechism, in which at least ten pastors and professors of recognized ability and standing are expected to participate, will appear in the April number of the QUARTERLY.

THE

QUARTERLY REVIEW

OF

THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

APRIL, 1887.

ARTICLE I.

THE ELEMENTS OF SUCCESS IN PREACHING.

By F. W. CONRAD, D. D., Philadelphia.

Preaching means proclaiming the gospel, as the embodiment of religious truth, and in its popular acceptation, it embraces both the sermon as a literary production, and its delivery as a rhetorical performance. It is a means to an end, and as such, must be constituted of such characteristics as are adapted to attain it. The end of preaching is to induce man to cultivate excellence of character and usefulness in this life, in order that he may attain immortal blessedness in that life to come.

The faculties of the soul, through the combined and consistent exercise of which the immediate and ultimate ends of preaching may be attained, are the imagination, the understanding, the heart, the conscience, the will and the memory. These faculties are distinct in their nature, and each is adapted to exert a specific influence upon the rest, culminating in their combined action upon the will. Each of these faculties is so constituted, that it can be reached and brought into proper exercise by the presentation of truth in a particular form. Graphic descriptions are calculated to kindle the imagination; clear statements and logical arguments to interest and convince the understanding; pathetic appeals to move the heart; ethical principles to bind the

conscience; and in their united motive power as recalled by memory, to influence the will in its choices. Just in proportion, therefore, as the elements that enter into the constitution of preaching are adapted to bring into healthy exercise each of the motive-bearing faculties just named, in that proportion will preaching tend to secure right action or success.

Speech is one of the greatest and best gifts of God to man. It gives expression to the hidden operations of the mind, heart and will of man, and reveals them to his fellows. This is done through conversation in social intercourse, writing and printing in literary circles, and by the proclamation of "the truth as it is in Jesus" any where but especially in the house of God. To attain success preaching must draw the hearers, secure their attention, impart instruction and employ all the motives of the law and the gospel, in order to induce repentance towards God, faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, growth in knowledge, and holiness, in usefulness and happiness. Preaching can be satisfied with nothing less, and without such results can not claim success, but must be pronounced a failure. Any thing, therefore, having a direct bearing upon, and an adaptation to secure any one of the results just mentioned, must constitute an element of success in preaching. In this category, we mention the following:

1. *The selection of a distinct subject or theme,* which should be couched and announced in a form of words calculated to excite interest and awaken expectation. This informing idea, as metaphysicians term it, should, like the germ deposited in the ground, draw around and assimilate to it, all the matter introduced into the discourse, which as it proceeds in its delivery, should continue to increase in intellectual and moral momentum, and culminate in making a distinct, deep and permanent impression upon every hearer. The practice of not announcing the theme under the impression that the hearers' curiosity will be awakened in discovering it as the delivery proceeds, has not unfrequently resulted in disappointment, the hearer not finding out what the topic was, and going home without any distinct idea of what the preacher preached about, and no recollection of anything in particular of what he said. The practice of get-

ting up sermons, without any particular subject and made up of fragmentary, disconnected remarks, is no less objectionable than that of withholding the announcement of the subject.

2. *Systematic arrangement.* The ideal sermon, as determined by homiletic rules, embraces the introduction designed to awaken attention to the subject, the body or matter consisting of statement, explanation, argument, description, illustration and exhortation, and the peroration or conclusion, applying and enforcing the moral and practical points contained in it. All the elements included in the subject matter may be found in a single discourse and most of them should constitute a part of each sermon in such a form and measure as the theme and design of the preacher may require. As order imparts additional strength, the systematic arrangement of the parts and matter of a sermon becomes an indispensable requisite in achieving success in preaching. What a thorough knowledge and skillful use of tools is to the mechanic, an accurate acquaintance with homiletics, and a wise application of the rules of sermonizing, are to the preacher. The neglect of its study and the depreciation of its value are alike to be deprecated. The self-conceit which, under the delusion of possessing such a degree of originality as to call forth successive and uninterrupted trains of consecutive thought, so as to render homiletic rules unnecessary, makes sad work in many pulpits. It excludes systematic arrangement which is one of the most important elements of success in preaching, and in many places multiplies ministerial failures.

3. *Excellence of style.* Language is the medium of expressing and communicating thought, and this is accordingly brought into requisition, and style becomes another important element in preaching. Its distinguishing features are clearness and simplicity, accuracy and terseness, beauty and force. Such a style of thought and composition is adapted to gain and keep the attention of the hearers, and bring into timely exercise the faculties necessary to success. The temptation to pervert the style of the pulpit is great, and many preachers have fallen into it. Overlooking the province of the understanding which is reached by instruction and argument, they have adopted a florid and fanciful style, calculated to tickle the fancy, inflame the imagin-

ation, and arouse the feelings, furnishing entertainment, and calling forth pleasing emotions, but which like dissolving views, flit in quick succession before the mind, making but a momentary impression and leaving no trace behind. Such a style of preaching, while it caters to curiosity, leaves the mind a blank, vitiates the taste, fails to reach the conscience or move the will, and cannot therefore attain the true end of preaching.

But there is also danger of so undervaluing the importance of cultivating excellence of style, that many entirely neglect it. Disparaging thorough ministerial training and relying upon the immediate assistance of the Holy Spirit, they neglect study and due preparation, depend upon the inspiration of the moment, and belch forth a torrent of ungrammatical and crude utterances, superficial and disconnected remarks, savoring more of the incoherent and unintelligible rantings of an ignorant mountebank, than the thoughtful, instructive and edifying promptings of the Holy Spirit.

But while the cases of the perversion and neglect of style just cited may be regarded as sporadic and extreme, there are not wanting examples among the regularly educated ministry, who by fastidiousness of taste and over nicety of expression weaken their style, and divest their discourses in a corresponding degree of effectiveness. As literary artists they paint with bright water colors, which may for a moment dazzle the fancy of the multitude, but which fail to make any lasting impression upon them, or, changing the figure, as clerical house-keepers, they furnish their tables with an excess of sweet-meats and a deficiency of solid and substantial food; or in other words, they give their boarders too much dessert, and too little bread and meat.

Nor must we overlook another kind of educated preachers, who greatly underrate the value of style, despise the graces of rhetoric, beauty of thought, and aptness and force of expression. They regard the truths of the Scriptures as possessed of such vitalizing power, that it proves more effective when unadorned with the attractions of style. They regard every person living within reach of their churches as morally bound to be regular attendants upon their unsavory ministrations and give the most

earnest heed to their undigested harangues, superficial platitudes, common-place utterances, and downright vulgarisms of style. When the outside world vote such preaching a bore and refuse to attend, and the inside elect, unable to discover the wheat among the chaff, drop off and seek for pasture elsewhere, then such slovenly preachers try to comfort themselves with the plea, that the children of this world do not appreciate *spiritual* preaching, and that even some of the children of light have itching ears, and, like the Greeks at Athens, are prone to run after new things. Whereas, the true state of things seems not to enter the minds of such preachers—that they themselves are at fault; that their miscalled sermons are so deficient in arrangement and matter and style, as to convey neither instruction to the impenitent, nor tend to the edification of believers.

4. *Scripturalness of matter.* Preaching is distinguished from all other forms of communicating ideas and facts through public address, by the peculiarity of the truth which it makes known. While preaching may properly appropriate all other kinds of truth and make them subservient to the attainment of its ends, its special province is to publish religious truth. And as its name originated in the Scriptures, its matter must also be drawn from the inspired word of God. The text, the subject of discourse, the matter introduced, and the lessons enforced, must be thoroughly scriptural. To take a text from the Bible, as the basis of some striking motto, and descant upon it with sentimental clap-trap, in a manner calculated to excite curiosity, provoke laughter and provide amusement for an audience, is not preaching *the Word*, but blatherskiting in the house of the Lord. Such preachers or rather declaimers, burn incense on the altar of God with strange fire, and feed their hearers with mere husks instead of the strong meat of the Word.

> "They win a smile, and court a grin,
> Where they should start a tear.
> The hungry sheep look up, and gape,
> And stare, and are not fed."

The Holy Ghost declares such preaching "as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal," and pronounces them to be "wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever."

The large proportion of Scripture, introduced by Mr. Moody into his addresses, and the tact with which he uses and applies it, constitutes the strongest element and the true secret of the success of his preaching. The remarkable popularity of Dr. John Hall of New York can be directly traced to the pre-eminent scriptural character of all his ministrations.

5. *Spiritual unction.* The natural man is the product of the creative work of the Father; the spiritual man is the product of the new-creating power of the Holy Ghost, through the redemption of the Son. The natural man can neither discern, know or receive the things of the Spirit of God, says Paul, and John declares that the Christian, the spiritual man has an unction from the Holy One, and knoweth all things. While, therefore the meaning of the Scriptures in their letter and form, may be apprehended by the natural reason of man, their hidden sense, spirit or essence, can only be apprehended through the aid or unction of the Holy Ghost.

In order to possess it, the preacher must be a man who has been begotten of the truth, born of the Spirit, and made a new creature in Christ Jesus. As a fountain cannot rise above its head, and men cannot gather figs of thistles, neither can the natural beget the spiritual; and the purely natural and rational exhibitions of unconverted preachers do not ordinarily and legitimately result in bringing men truly to the knowledge of the truth, and if, notwithstanding this, any are led to Christ through them, it is not because of, but in spite of their rational performance. They must therefore be classed among those who sat in Moses' seat in Christ's day, and who, although they expounded the law, neither understood its spirit nor practiced its precepts in their lives.

This "unction" cannot be described any more than the operations of the Spirit in effecting regeneration. It bears the same relation to the natural understanding, as a knowing faculty, as genius does to the ordinary insight of the aesthetic faculty. Genius gives the poet, the musician, the artist, such an insight into the ideal of beauty in poetry, music, sculpture and painting, and so stimulates in them efforts to actualize their ideals in verse, melody and form, but the ordinary aesthetic capacity of

man, may, in a measure, appreciate the beautiful, when exhibited to it, but destitute of genius it cannot create beauty itself. And so the spiritual unction of the preacher gives him such an insight into the true sense of Scripture, renders it so congenial to him, and impels him to expound it with earnestness and delight, to his hearers, while the unconverted preacher, destitute of it, sees and presents only the husk of truth in a mechanical way, with no more special interest in preaching than the hireling has in going through the routine of his task, impelled by the expectation of his wages. But while it cannot be described, and cannot be discerned by the natural man, although he may feel its influence without knowing what it is, it is at once discerned by the true Christian. There is a *some*thing about the character, tone and manner of a man of God, explaining with spirited unction the mysteries of religious experience and true godliness, which those who have experimental piety immedialy discern, and their spirits are kindled and their hearts edified by it. It was this that Christ referred to when he said: "I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine. My sheep hear my voice, I know them and they follow me, but a stranger will they not follow, because they know not the voice of strangers."

6. *The skillful use of figures.* As the imagination originates intellectual imagery, so does it delight in figures of speech, and through them becomes the medium of imparting instruction. What color and expression are to a painting, figure imparts to thought and speech. It is the ornament that adorns language with beauty, and invests it both with attractions and force. It furnishes the sparks that kindle speech into a glow, and furnishes the fire of oratory. Figure embraces beautiful imagery in expression, analogies between natural and supernatural truths, comparisons between the operations of nature and the influences of the Holy Spirit, contrasts between the things of this world, and the things of the world to come. Good judgment must be exercised in the degree and skillful use of imagery in preaching.

As the palate is surfeited with a surplus of sweet-meats, but feels a want when it receives none at all, a lady when overdressed with ribbons and jewelry destroys her attractiveness on

the one hand, and by disregard of propriety and beauty of dress, gains little consideration on the other. Due proportion in each example would furnish the happy medium, and attain the best results in supplying the body with food, and ornamenting the person with taste and beauty. And the same is true in the use of figure in preaching. Men of fine imaginations are in danger of being so carried away with the ornate in preaching, as to indulge in excess of imagery, at the expense of other equally important elements in preaching; while men of little imagination may so neglect it that their sermons might be compared to a tree, with trunk and branches, but destitute of leaves and flowers. The wisdom of the preacher must be exercised in attaining the golden mean, which will determine in a good degree, the measure of success in preaching.

7. *Apt Illustrations.* The impressions of sense are stronger than the apprehensions of thought. We are more impressed by witnessing an event, than by reading or hearing an account of it. This is the secret of the power of the drama, and the popularity of object-teaching, and panoramic exhibitions. The same distinction obtains between the mere statement of a truth and its presentation through a graphic illustration, as well as between the mere narration and the witnessing of events. These illustrations may be invented by the mind, drawn from the records of history, the facts of science, the works of nature, the habits of animals, the vegetable kingdom, daily occurrences, providential circumstances, and the thesaurus of anecdote. The judgment of the preacher must determine the number and character of the illustrations which he may introduce into his discourses, and upon the skill shown by him in embellishing them thereby will depend, in large measure, both the attractiveness and effectiveness of his preaching.

8. *Variety of topics.* The eye wearies in looking without diversion at the same objects; the ear grows dull under the same sounds; and the palate at last rejects the most delicious food with which it has become satiated. Change is indispensable to sharpen the edge of the pleasures of sense, and variety of topics to excite and keep up the interest of the hearer in preaching. Variety should, however, not be confined to change of subject,

but include also different arrangement, peculiarity of treatment, variations in expression as well in the method of communication and the style of delivery. Although it may be said, apologetically, that the essential doctrines of Christianity are comparatively few, and that the Christian pulpit has but one theme, "Jesus Christ and him crucified,"—it should be answered that when the extent of the Scriptures, the number of the subjects they contain, the different forms in which they are presented, the number of the writers, and the peculiarities of method and style adopted by them, are all considered, it would seem that no sufficient apology can be made by the preachers to the people, for converting the pulpit into a tread-mill in which they make their narrow weekly round, in the same measured step, and accompanied with the same tune, set to the same key. Where sameness of subjects and perpetual repetitions of the same ideas and phrases weary the hearers, fail to edify, and reduce their number, an important element of success in preaching is wanting, for which no satisfactory apology can be made.

9. *Adaptation to the wants of all.* Congregations are made up of persons of all ages, sexes, classes, vocations, conditions and character. Each person has peculiar constitutional wants, is placed in different circumstances, and exposed to special temptations. The same may be said of classes and their peculiar condition and surroundings. With these the preacher should acquaint himself by personal intercourse, pastoral visitation and observation, and to the supply of their respective wants he should endeavor to adapt his preaching. For the accomplishment of this important end God has made special provision in his word, and given special directions to his ministers. The Scriptures contain milk for babes and strong meat for those who are of riper age. The duty of feeding both the lambs and the sheep of the fold, of withholding from the people nothing revealed by God that would be profitable to them, and of giving to saint and sinner his due portion in season, is enjoined upon every embassador of Christ, and constitutes an important element of success in preaching.

10. *An effective delivery.* Commencing with the choice of a

distinct subject, as the first, we have presented consecutively eight other elements that enter into the constitution of a model sermon, and according to the natural order, we now add delivery as the tenth element of success in preaching. Although placed last, it is by no means the least, but the greatest. Indeed, a sermon may be so successfully prepared as to attain almost ideal perfection, and be delivered in so defective a manner as to fail in the attainment of its end. What is true of a single sermon is not unfrequently illustrated in the history of the pulpit. There are hundreds of pastors who prepare their sermons so carefully that they attain rare excellence as sermonizers, but are either so deficient in gifts of speech, or have been so wanting in their elocutionary training, or have contracted such a poor, monotonous delivery, or so fallen into the habit of reading closely in a humdrum manner, that their preaching became uninteresting to their audiences, and proved comparatively unsuccessful. Too much stress cannot, therefore, be laid upon delivery and its importance cannot well be overestimated. Yet, strange to say, there is no part of a minister's education which has received so little direct attention, and been so generally neglected as that of delivery.

Delivery is to the sermon what speech is to thought. While undelivered, like thought unexpressed, it can only be known by and exert an influence upon its composer. To instruct and influence others it must be delivered. Rhetoric, as an art, is not subjective. Its rules are not based upon abstract principles but drawn from observation. The rhetoricians observed how effective orators spoke, and thus learned the art of speaking, and their directions are designed to secure an imitation of the promptings of nature in oratory. We consequently place naturalness at the head of the characteristics of delivery. This cannot well be described, but it can very readily be detected. Observe two intelligent men in conversation on an important subject on which they are both deeply interested. How earnest they become! How rapidly thought is generated! How spontaneous their utterances! How clear and forcible their language! How emphatic their mode of expression! And how natural their whole manner of speech! As a listener, your attention

is fixed; you become absorbed in the conversation, and carry lasting impressions away. Now let all this be changed! A stenographer has taken down the conversation, and the same men appear before you with copy in hand, read the conversation to you in monotonous tones, after the manner of a school boy, and you will be struck with the greatness of the change. You will be compelled to make an effort to give them your attention, and feel relieved when it is over. This illustrates the difference between a natural and an unnatural delivery. We admit, however, that there are some readers of sermons, who so closely imitate nature in their delivery that they become effective in their pulpit ministrations; while on the other hand, there are those also, who, either from want of ability, neglect of preparation, and the contraction of an unnatural manner, exhibit defects in their delivery, no less marked than those of poor readers, and detract in a corresponding degree from their success in preaching. Naturalness embraces ease and self-possession, expressive posture, movement and gesture, which we must content ourselves in merely mentioning.

As description is rendered emphatic by contrast, we also mention awkwardness, a lazy, lounging attitude, leaning on the pulpit-board, staring at vacancy, turning towards one part of the audience, pounding the pulpit, stamping the feet, clapping the hands, turning the eye brows up and down, straining the voice to the highest pitch, suddenly lowering it to a whisper as well as all grotesque postures in the pulpit, as detrimental to effective delivery.

Nor must we overlook the abuse of emphasis by its too frequent and improper use, so as to lose its effect and become monotonous and insignificant. Affectation of tone and manner are no less objectionable. There is also a non-descript but prevalent manner of delivery, designated by Dr. Schmucker as the *preacher's*, as distinguished from the natural speaker's style. We called it a *mouthing* style at the seminary. It is contracted under the impression that preaching is something so different from talking, that a peculiar style and solemnity of tone and expression are demanded, and in departing from nature, each preacher who has contracted such habit, cannot easily correct it, although

he may know that it has not only spoiled his own natural style, but has also impaired his efficiency and usefulness in the pulpit. There are some preachers who are so inveterately given to this unfortunate habit of speaking that they cannot read a chapter, offer a prayer in a family, or even say grace at table, without doing it in a loud, awfully solemn, unnatural, affected and altogether unbecoming manner.

But we have exhausted our allotted space, and in conclusion we desire to emphasize the peroration of a sermon, its character, design and delivery. Its design may be learned from its etymology—*per*, through *oratio*, the discourse, *going through or over the discourse;* that is, rehearse the parts of the discourse, in order to secure concentration of their combined force upon the hearer. Its special significance is involved in its being the conclusion. Like the closing words of a testament, or the last paragraph of an authoritative political proclamation, the concluding part of a sermon should be naturally and skilfully arranged, carefully worded, tersely expressed, and impressively delivered. It is also called the application, signifying that through all the lessons taught, the moral principles inculcated and the practical duties enjoined, are to be applied and enforced. The peroration bears the same relation to a sermon that the lawyer's summing up does to his whole case, and as the analysis of the evidence and the presentation of the points of law by the judge do to his whole charge. The lawyer who should so undervalue the summing up as to neglect it, would not only lose his case, but his reputation and practice also. The judge who should fail to bring the salient points of the law and the evidence before the jury, would leave their minds in a state of doubt and perplexity, rendering an intelligent verdict according to the facts involved, impossible. And the preacher who neglects to close his sermons with inferential, recapitulating, hortatory perorations, and who satisfies himself with a few concluding sentences, referring to the subject, and ending with the stereotyped ejaculation: "The Lord add his blessing," divests his discourses of their most important part and fails in making a distinct impression of the truth contained in his sub-

ject. A sermon without a peroration is a rhetorical blunder and literary botch-work. It is like a word without its last syllable, a paragraph without its last sentence, a book without its last chapter.

As a striking illustration of all the elements of success in preaching united in one person, we present *Luther as a pulpit orator.* Oratory is, in many respects, the greatest gift that God has conferred upon man. The attainment of eminence in its practice requires such a combination of intellect and sensibility, imagination and logic, genius and acquirements, together with voice, manner and physique as are found in but few men. The great orators of the world can be counted upon the fingers of a man, Demosthenes, Cicero, Chrysostom, Massillon, Whitfield, Pitt, Webster, and Luther towering above them all. Melanchthon said of the latter, that his words were "thunderbolts," and Jean Paul Richter pronounced them "half battles." Dr. Calvin E. Stowe describes him in the following discriminating and graphic manner: "Luther, as a revolutionary orator, was irresistible. So much coolness, and so much fire; so much self-possession, and so much excitability; so much logical power, and so much exuberance of fancy; so much good sense, and so much ready wit, with such advantages of person and voice, has seldom, if ever been found in one individual. Conceive of the steady, flaming, religious fervor of George Whitfield, united with the perspicuity to seize, and the genius to reproduce, every phase and fleeting form of human character—the skill to touch, by the right word and the right metaphor, in exactly the right place, every chord of popular emotion, which characterizes Shakespeare, and all this set off with a muscular frame of fine proportions and manly strength, a fair glowing face, which portrayed every sentiment before it was uttered, a large, clear, blue eye, that radiated his very soul (and such a soul!), a voice powerful as thunder and musical as an organ, and you have some idea of what Luther was as a public speaker." And in describing the effectiveness of Luther as a pulpit orator, he says, "His sentences were like charges of grape and canister shot—hitting in all directions, hitting every where, and hitting all the time." And I add, hitting with such crushing weight as to demolish the

superstructure of error set up by Romanism, and rearing on their ruins monuments of truth, that mark the pathway of modern civilization and Christianity.

ARTICLE II.

THE GROUNDS OF HEATHEN SALVATION.

By Rev. Prof. J. C. F. Rupp, A. M., Zelienople, Pa.

Sometimes the place which a question gains in the public mind is out of all proportion to its importance; yet the emphasis laid upon some features of such a question often has the tendency to mischievous results. For example, nearly all the great controversies in the Christian world had their origin in beginnings which in their development marked epochs in religious thought. The present discussion of the theory of probation after death is such a question. It is looming up in vast proportions in view of its possible influence. It may revolutionize the conservatism of the past. It is invading the Church's most promising field. It robs the earnest missionary of his chiefest glory and most inspiring motives, making his self-sacrifice only a selfish aim, and him the votary to mistaken views and devotee to fanatical impulses.

In their latest utterances the advocates of this theory, which has not yet risen to the dignity of a doctrine, argue that the vast majority of men who have lived, or are now living, have received or will receive their personal probation beyond death: *all* those indeed who do not finally reject Christ during the earthly life will have another opportunity for the formation of personal character, on the basis and under the motives of a system of redemption.

This proposition has two aspects: as a question of pure dialectics it might enlist the sympathies of many, who cannot admit of other than intellectual elements in the demonstration of a theorem, and again, in questions of faith rather than knowledge, refuse to bend everything to the necessary lines of thought. Our limited intellectual horizon weakens the force of arguments

based solely on human consciousness. For this is not a question which appeals for its solution to intellectual, ethical or æsthetic emotions. Our higher sensibilities, our ideas of right and wrong, our judgment and reason, cannot read the mind and will of God, or determine divine decrees. Hence, we look for bed-rock on which to build. Like a storm-tossed ship we must anchor to solid foundation.

This theory in the religious world has an analogous position to evolution in the physical world. Its advocates claim that it is the necessary and scientific development of religious thought. They represent various shades of opinion. Like some philosophers who admit the results of evolution but dispute its methods, they refuse to be classified as "new theologians," yet accept the product of the "progressive theology." They have as confident hope for the heathen as for their own salvation. They do not experience Luther's difficulty to understand how God can be just and yet justify the sinner, even *on* the merits and conditions of the atonement; *apart* from the vicarious sacrifice *they* cannot understand how God can be just without justifying the sinner. They are zealots like Dr. Hawkins, who out of their tender sympathies believe in heathen salvation, but give only a disloyal support to their logical premise. They have no one distinct and positive reason for the hope that is in them, but ground their arguments on human sensibilities and rational consciousness, and then marshal in confirmation of their opinion isolated and detached passages of Scripture. Such arguments have not the strength displayed by scholars of solid attainments, who, like Archdeacon Farrar, base their hypotheses on the solitary texts of Scripture, and support their exegesis by brilliant rhetoric. But there is another class, who, like Bishop Foster, in his *Outlook of the World*,* seem content, with more confidence, to rest their convictions on the *a priori* conceptions of truth and intellectual strength, and with less concern for any biblical support to these judgments of reason.

The theory of probation after death, as now expounded, is the logical development of the conviction which Dr. Hawkins

*N. Y. *Independent*, April 15, 1886.

avows with respect to the heathen. Now, I propose to discuss the principles underlying the salvation of the heathen with reference to the theory of probation only where they touch. Yet the rule which determines the grounds of heathen salvation is a final answer to this theory of probation, and *vice versa*. There must be some norm of authority by which to determine correct principles in this question of heathen salvation. It will determine the method by which are appropriated to the heathen the mediatorial work and the merits of Christ's death. It will disclose the underlying principles in our theory of heathen salvation. The word of God declares that there is only one name given under heaven among men whereby they must be saved. No fertile imagination can find a substitute for this universal condition, whatever other figments may be read into the saving doctrine of the word of life. The one method of appropriation by faith seems to be as general, for the divine commission is given in all seriousness, to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. It touches every spot on the globe and includes every rational creature outside of the pale of visible discipleship; and, while this condition lasts, will "the missionary department of the Christian ministry abide in the Church a divine institution."

Probation after death is an attempt to define the mode of this appropriation by faith. But neither it nor any other mode for heathen salvation, which has been mentioned, is on historical ground in its apprehension of truth. They all profess hostility to the so-called scholastic dogmatism, yet agree with the most rationalistic type of scholasticism in affirming that only what is clearly known can be trustworthy; and make self-consciousness the ultimate source and ground of religious knowledge. Perhaps I ought to correct an inaccuracy, for this tendency is historical; it produced both the extravagances of mysticism and the later skeptical rationalism, besides many other isms.

Theology is well-named the queen of sciences, for its material and rule of scientific inquiry are of the highest source and authority; and in the use of these divine elements it has enlisted the support of the highest human powers and faculties. Its form is scientific, but many of its fundamental principles are laid

and sealed in the blood of martyrs. Apply the principles of scientific theology to this question of probation, then analyze the elements on which the theory is built, and lastly by a correct exegesis, not of paragraphs but of the whole word of God, discover the primordial on which a true theory of heathen salvation is grounded.

I. The "new or progressive theologians" find fault with dogmatic theology touching this theme without first inquiring into its fundamental principles. Hence, for a moment look at the historical grounds of scripture-interpretation in the Christian Church.

For the source of religious knowledge and the supreme rule of faith, Roman Catholics appeal to scripture and tradition, "laying the chief stress on tradition. Evangelical Protestantism makes the scripture alone the supreme rule, but uses tradition and reason as means in ascertaining its true sense."* The common principle on which the Reformers stood was the principle of Christianity itself as revealed in scripture. These principles underlie three great systems of theology, for there are two distinct types of Protestant theology. The Reformed begins with scripture as the rule by which to determine its theology; the Lutheran begins with the word of scripture and builds on this foundation. The one reasons from divine decrees by inexorable logic; the other begins with the incarnation and person of Christ. The one builds like Abelard by reason, the other like Anselm by faith. "The legitimate use of reason is allowed by the Catholic and still more by the Protestant Church, and both have produced scholastic systems in full harmony with orthodoxy. Christianity is above reason, but not against reason."† Hence with these primal differences and by an honest use of these principles, there can be no wide divergence from a common result. The Roman Catholic would proceed by sight and sense, the Reformed by reason, which is the limit of its credibility, and the Lutheran by faith which subordinates and sanctifies reason. Thus, there is a difference in the methods of appre-

*Dr. Schaff, *Hom. Rev.*, June, 1886. †Dr. Schaff, Ibid.

hending truth. Do these different methods produce different results, when applied to the theory of probation?

What hope of heathen salvation does Roman Catholic tradition entertain? "It almost closes the door of heaven against all who are living in the valley of the shadow of death."* The epistle to the Hebrews declares that it is appointed unto men once to die but after this the judgment,—Roman Catholics add, "*immediately*, when the soul's eternal destiny is then and there determined."* Even that poetic fiction which they call purgatory,—but which the "new movement" calls "personal probation after death for the majority of men"—where the soul that is in a state of grace, but defiled by the guilt of all but mortal sin, must tarry until, by its atonement in suffering, it is purified from all stains, is not open to the heathen. Says Archbishop Kenrick who is called the glory of the American Catholic Church: "We can entertain hope for such as never heard of the institution of baptism, if with all their heart they sought God under the influence of his grace and with an earnest desire to do his will. But for such as may be guiltless in not having received it because they were ignorant of its divine institution, salvation is not secure. Their delinquencies against the natural law are just subject of condemnation: for whoever sinned without the law shall perish without the law. It is not for us to excuse or condemn, but simply recognize baptism as a necessary means of salvation. Salvation and the necessary means of obtaining it are the gratuitous gifts of divine bounty, and the judgments of God though just are unsearchable. When a condition of salvation is proclaimed on divine authority, it is rash to indulge in speculation; it is impious to arraign the divine decree at the tribunal of our erring reason. * * Whatever hope may be entertained of the salvation of those who have not heard the name of Christ, it must always be limited to such as through the inspiration of divine grace conceive supernatural faith in the existence of God and the rewards of a future life; for without such faith it is impossible to please God."†

---

*L. W. Reily, *N. Y. Independent*, Oct. '86.

†See same, *N. Y. Ind.*, Oct. '86.

Even Dr. Hawkins concedes that there is but little more encouragement to be derived from the logical and formal method of apprehending religious truth. Dr. Withrow said, in his annual sermon before the Des Moines Convention, that "The heathen are not under exceptional and hopeless condemnation; that it has been hailed as a sign of progress and a proof that he is freeing himself from the bond of bigotry, when a man declares that he does not believe in the unconditional condemnation of the heathen. But who does believe such a thing?"

Evidently this eminent divine differs from Dr. Hawkins' understanding of the confession, for he says, "Knowing the Confession of Westminster is closely wrought on the articles of election and eternal destiny, one naturally turns to see if it says such a thing as that the heathen are under unconditional and causeless sentence of judgment. But looking, one finds it does not. For very distinctly those venerable divines of Westminster, in composing the confession, declared that 'none are under condemnation and dishonor except for their sins.'"

There is a rationalizing tendency in this formal method of apprehending religious truth, and whatever their other failings these confessors were not guilty of false logic. If we grant their premises, no doubt we will agree with their conclusions. For it is called only a spurious Calvinism which was voiced in the rebuke of the young cobbler who became Cary the missionary: that when God wants to convert the heathen he will do it without human help. The American Board for Foreign Missions adopted this resolution: "That this Board distinctly and emphatically disavows its belief in what is called the doctrine of probation after death." With reference to the tendency of this principle so condemned "they do heartily approve the action of the Prudential Committee in carefully guarding the Board from any committal to the approval of that doctrine, and advise a continuance of the caution in time to come." The action so commended was the refusal to appoint as missionaries candidates theologically unfit because of their belief in future probation, because of its "strong conviction that this new view is unscriptural and pernicious, tending to lead multitudes to fatal delusion,

ruinous to souls both in the present world and in the world to come."*

This system of theology proceeds by necessary laws of thought from a formulated structure to Christ. Rev. Dr. Wm. Hayes Ward well defines it: "I never had any reason to vary from that vital doctrine which holds that the way to see the truth of God is by studying God's word, and getting at it through the reason and by faith in God." Again: "I do not like the new theory because I think it is based partly on a 'Christocentric' conception of theology which seems to me unreasonable, and partly because it is based upon an over-orthodox and over-strict theory of the interpretation of the scripture, which says that only those who believe shall be saved; and it draws the conclusion that if these people do not believe in this world, and they are going to be saved, it must be that they are going to get their belief in another world, because then they will have Christ presented to them and will then be saved."† This is the deductive method which proceeds from a general truth, the divine decrees and eternal destiny, to particular conclusions.

The Lutheran system, however, is Christocentric because it begins in Christ and builds on him as the chief corner-stone, but it also believes that now is the day of salvation. It is the inductive method by which from well-known particulars we arrive at general truths. Dr. Hawkins seems more comforted by what he calls the silence of the Lutheran Confessions, as if they had ignored a difficult question and shunned the responsibility of an expression. This is not the historical character of Lutheranism. It is wrought on the material principle, salvation by faith in Christ, and its use of scripture as a formal principle determines the properties of this faith. Its silence is due to the general argument, but much is implied in the confessions on other points which bear directly on this. For example: "The Gospel is properly such a doctrine as teaches what he who has not observed the law and therefore is condemned by it should believe, viz., Christ has expiated and made satisfaction for all sins, and without any merit of theirs has obtained forgiveness of sins, righteousness that avails before God and eternal life."‡

*The Great Debate, p. 47. †The Great Debate, p. 54.
‡See Schmid's Dogmatic.

Lutheran theology teaches that the Spirit of God operates in the hearts of men only through the Word and Sacraments. "Faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God" "The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart: that is, the word which we preach." This word comes to men in two ways. It is either natural or revealed. "Full and saving knowledge of God we obtain, of course, only through revelation. But aside from this there exists a knowledge of God, for we find it even among the heathen."* This natural knowledge of God which the heathen possess may be extended and confirmed by contemplation of the works and ways of God in nature and in history; but when so acquired it is subject to corruption and is at best very imperfect and, for this reason, insufficient to secure salvation. It is only the remnant of the knowledge which but for the fall would have been full and rich. It seems to awaken longing after true and perfect knowledge, and in some measure to regulate moral deportment. "Beyond all that we can learn concerning God and his relation to the world from reason and nature, there is room and necessity for the light and teaching of a supernatural revelation. The history of mankind shows unquestionably that when left to the mere light of nature and reason men hold low and inadequate conceptions of God, and are woefully wanting in the knowledge necessary to a right, pure and happy life. Even the most cultured nations without God's word have failed to attain a clear or steady conception of his character and will."†

This knowledge contains only the seed of the word, which in its original form was a part of the mental endowment of our first parents. In its fragmentary condition it is, as it were, only a little spark of primeval light, a diminutive drop from a vast ocean, or an atom of the ashes of a splendid house in ruins. Yet this spark is sufficient to kindle beacons which blaze from every cliff in heathenism. "By the authority of the word of God we do unquestionably know, past all peradventure do know, that men passing beyond the limits of this life are to be judged by the light they had in this life that has passed here. And the

*See Schmid's Dogmatic. †Valentine's Rational Theism, 270.

responsibility is theirs for following the guidance of that light given according to this word to all men, which though it had but a single ray in the thick night of heathenism, and shining never so dimly, would in the issue have led those who followed it inevitably to the cross of Jesus Christ."* This is, as it were, a conditional sentence in Greek syntax, where the protasis states a present or past supposition contrary to fact or reality, and implies that the condition is not or was not fulfilled. Dr. Schaff (whom, strangely enough, Dr. Hawkins incorrectly quotes as supporting probation after death†) says, "There was a spiritual Israel scattered throughout the heathen world, that never received the circumcision of the flesh, but the unseen circumcision of the heart by the hand of that spirit which boweth where it listeth, and is not bound to any human laws and to ordinary means. The Old Testament furnishes several examples of true piety outside of the visible communion with the Jewish Church, in the persons of Melchisedec, the friend of Abraham, the royal priest, the type of Christ; Jethro, the priest of Midian; Rahab, the Canaanite woman and hostess of Joshua and Caleb; Ruth, the Moabitess and ancestress of our Saviour; King Hiram, the friend of David; the Queen of Sheba, who came to admire the wisdom of Solomon; Naaman the Syrian; and especially Job, the sublime sufferer, who rejoiced in the hope of his Redeemer."‡

These exceptions are examples of the extraordinary influence of the Holy Spirit and only serve to confirm the rule that divine grace does not come immediately. Where God has a special purpose, as in these examples, he confirms by his revealed word through his servants and prophets natural knowledge of himself. These rare examples of divine influence conclusively prove that such knowledge, although it did serve in them as such a medium, is totally corrupted by the wicked and deceitful heart.

There are some rare names in secular history also, as Confucius, Plato, Senaca, who are real noblemen by nature. But only one Plato is worthy of canonization. There are few such examples

---

*Dr. E. P. Goodwin, The Great Debate, 66.

†See Hist. of Christ. Ch.: Vol. II Ante-Nicene Christ., p. 611.

‡Hist. Christ. Ch., Vol. I: Apost. Christianity, p. 75.

in history, and fewer still of the uncultured Platos in the story of Christian missions. My one-time instructor, Dr. C. A. Stork, related an account of one such narrated, I believe, by Eliot, the missionary to the Indians; he was an Indian of devout and exalted moral qualities, who confirmed in his own experience the story of salvation. For he was sinful and unable to remedy his condition. But he reasoned and felt that God is good and must have made by the atonemement of a Perfect Man full and vicarious satisfaction for him. He confided in this hope. He mentioned even a more notable character discovered in the wilds of Africa, whose knowledge acquired only by the light of nature was so accurate that he too believed there was a Saviour although he knew nothing of his historical manifestation. This same natural illumination has been graphically described in the opening chapters of Ben-Hur, in which divine grace is represented as operating through this spermatic word, as the medium, to lead the Hindu, the Egyptian and Greek to meet in the desert, whence, enlightened by his Star in the east, they now come to accept and adore their Saviour, who is the ideal and the fulfilment of philosophy and civilization of every type and age. I do not raise the question whether these rare individuals had a saving knowledge of Christ, but insist that even in such case they are too few to be more than isolated examples in as many centuries. There may be others of whom "like the mute and inglorious Miltons" we never hear, but they are only as drops in the ocean of humanity, for the Lord is not without a witness even in Babylon. Dr. Schaff says of ancient heathenism, and it is as true of modern heathenism: "The scattered elements of truth, morality and piety may be ascribed to three sources. In the first place, man even in his fallen state retains some traces of the divine image, a knowledge of God however weak, a moral sense or conscience, and a longing for union with the God-head, for truth and for righteousness. Secondly, some account must be made of traditions and recollections, however faint, coming down from the general primal revelations to Adam and Noah. But the third and most important of the heathen anticipations of truth is the all-ruling providence of God, who has never left himself without a witness. If such anticipation and knowledge of truth

is sufficient in such cases to be a medium of grace, these examples, at best, are only as Lot in Sodom and Gomorrah. But on what authority can Dr. Hawkins declare that *most* of the heathen will be saved?

II. If we analyze this theory of probation, we will find in it over against the strength of orthodoxy some inherent weaknesses, constitutional ailments which are incurable.

First, its foundation is weak. It is like the Washington monument which stood unfinished for half a century on its shattered base; but no amount of ecclesiastical engineering can replace with firm foundation its frail support without cracking the beautiful walls of this house built on sand. Nor is it true, I believe, as Dr. Hawkins asserts, that you can prove anything out of the Bible. For the word is a unit and sets forth but one doctrine of salvation.

A proper system of hermeneutics has not been, nor can be, built on rational consciousness, much less on human sensibilities. Rationalism is the main plank in the ground-work of the "new theology." It raises human reason above scripture and tradition, and accepts them only so far as they come within the limits of its comprehension. "It is in the modern what Gnosticism was in the ancient church—a revolt of private judgment against the popular faith and Church orthodoxy, an over-estimate of rhetoric knowledge but also a wholesome stimulus to inquiry and progress. It is not a church, or sect, but a school in the church, or rather, a number of schools which differ very considerably from each other."* By legitimate use of reason there is real progress, but this progress is perfectly consistent with a belief in revelation on subjects which lie beyond the boundary of time and sense. Luther repudiated the mystic dogma of the inner word and spirit, and insisted on submission to the written letter of the scriptures. He attributed all the errors and fanaticism of the Reformation period to the presumptuous inroads of human reason into the domain of faith.† This is the fundamental principle of this theory of probation, a rational and emotional abstraction, which appeals to scripture only for toler-

*See Schaff's Ref. and Rational. *Hom. Rev.*, June 1886.

†See Schaff, Ibid.

ation. But every passage, which it is claimed endorses this theory, is a minor chord in some greater symphony. To read into it human subjectivity is to introduce a discord in the general harmony, by separating it from its grammatical and historical connections.

Matt. 12 : 32 is often cited as a witness to this hypothesis but in violation of sound principles of hermeneutics. For the Saviour evidently taught that this sin against the Holy Ghost is never forgiven in this world, much less in the world to come. St. Mark (3 : 30) says "he that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness but is in danger of eternal damnation.* This language of hyperbole and exaggeration has the very opposite effect here claimed for it. It is to be interpreted in a manner precisely similar to the interpretation of Luke 14 : 26 where the Lord teaches the necessity of domestic love.

1 Peter 3 : 19 is another example of subjective interpretation. Besides the reasonable and orthodox understanding, it is also capable of a distinctly Lutheran interpretation. Here our Saviour's preaching was not of the gospel as on the Mount, but it was the proclamation of a herald. This is apparent to one who takes the trouble to compare the words in the original. The passage means Christ's descent "into hell to triumph over demons (see Col. 2 : 15 and Rev. 1 : 18), and to convince men that they were justly shut up in the infernal prison. His preaching in hell was *not evangelical*, which is proclaimed only to men in the kingdom of grace, but legal, accusatory, terrible. Even the antediluvians ought to have believed on Christ."†

Anything might be proven out of the Bible by such eclectic interpretation. It denied the doctrine of the Trinity until subjective personality was eliminated from exegesis. Then this great doctrine stood forth on the testimony of the whole inspired record, reasonable but higher than reason. Turn upon these passages the radiancy divine of such passages as Matt. 25 : 31ff, where the final judgment is described without any reference to this state of intermediary probation; and Luke 16 : 26, where

*See note Schaff's Hist. Christ. Ch., Vol. II, p. 607.

†Schmid's Dogmat. (Holl. 778).

again it is expressly declared by the Lord himself that an impassable gulf separates the two parts of the spirit world. The figment of a third place lacks scriptural authority. The Greek *Hades* is used in the LXX to translate the Hebrew *Sheol.* Here our Saviour uses it as the equivalent of *Gehenna.* Perhaps he uses *Gehenna* as the equivalent of *Sheol*; at any rate there is an honest doubt whether in its New Testament use *Hades* means anything else than the place of torment.

The theory of probation after death takes only a one-sided view of the atonement. Its advocates warmly champion the truth of a universal atonement, but they overlook the universal condition which in effect is of equal importance. The atonement is universally efficient but not universally effective, because its conditions are not complied with; it is capable of universal effect, because God's word says it is: "for God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth on him should not perish but have everlasting life." To assert, however, that the atonement is of different appropriation, is to limit its universality by other conditions than the one here and everywhere declared. Dr. Hawkins must prove a very difficult problem: that the character of God is double: that there are two standards of right and wrong: that another revelation has been made than is made, or grant that all men are saved by the one atonement and judged by the same standard. For the character of God is always the same. He is none the less an inexorable judge, which alone our fathers supposed, but is at the same time to us a loving Father. Shall not the judge of all the earth do right? For a heathen to lie and cheat and steal is sin; the pride of the flesh and lust of the eye are everywhere sin, and sin is everywhere under condemnation of the law. To some is given the law written in the heart, to others engraved on stone. In one case the penalty of the broken law is few stripes, in the other many. It is in both cases the same penalty of the same broken law, but in the one much darkened by the desperately wicked and most deceitful heart. This, it is said, makes degrees in sin; yes, and degrees in the same penalty: such a difference in degrees, for example, as exists between Cain's guilt and the guilt of the dram-seller:

"Accursed was the name of him who slew a righteous man whose soul was ripe for heaven; thrice accursed he whose art malignant sinks a soul in hell."

Now we cannot conceive of such a monstrosity in the judicial dealings of man with man, as would say that one may knowingly violate the law and be pronounced innocent, whereas another doing the same thing is guilty. It has been well said that this theory of probation involves the relation of the atonement to the moral government of God. It involves the doctrine of sin, changes the doctrine of the judgment, impeaches the justice of God, and is perfectly and thoroughly revolutionary of the general understanding of the doctrines of grace.*

It also misrepresents the real character of heathenism. The prophets, poets and apostles of inspiration have described "the abominations of the heathen" (2 Kgs. 16 : 3), "the heathen as sunk into the pit that they have made" (Ps. 9 : 15), and as "walking in the vanity of their mind having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them because of the blindness of their hearts, who being past feeling have given themselves over unto lasciviousness to work uncleanness and greediness" (Eph. 6 : 19; see also 1 Pet. 4 : 3–6).

The advocates of probation after death plead feelingly for the Gracchi; they have read only the Homers and Virgils and Horaces. They have not read the Juvenals who portray universal infamy and plebeian debauchery. Hear the indictment of Seneca: "We have sinned, and we shall continually do so till the end of time. It is the complaint of our ancestors; it is ours; it will be of our posterity, that morals are perverted, that corruption reigns,"

This sad picture is more exclusively true in barbarous states where there is no refining influence of art and letters. But we are not limited to the past, for missionaries are now constantly repeating the observation of the first missionary to the Gentiles. And, "unless the witnesses are corrupt or incompetent, the case stands proven; that the pagan world is now lying in wickedness." Else being without sin, they are better off without the

*See The Great Debate, 56.

Bible than we are with it. This extract from a letter of a missionary of South India of over twenty-five years' experience is pertinent to this topic: "Would you like to know what the most common by far of all the objections the people make to Christianity is? It is this. Your religion will not allow a man to lie, or steal or deceive, or do any of that sort of thing. We can't live without doing them. Your religion is very good, but we cannot follow it."*

The heathen have the law that is written in the heart, and so are a law unto themselves; but by this law they have knowledge of sin, and all they which do such things are worthy of death. Conscience is the voice of this unwritten law, and it condemns them, else there is no significance in the sacrifices and ceremonies of heathen worship.

III. The progressive theology inculcates this theory of probation, or a hope of salvation for the heathen, not because it is expressly set down in scripture, but because it is not expressly cut off by it. Indeeed it treats the Bible as a book containing as much error as it certainly does truth. In this emergency it supplements the positive teaching of the Bible by enlarging on the negative revelation by recourse to reason, but without warrant; for the one doctrine of God utters no uncertain sound touching this question of probation after death. It lacks in scriptural authority and spiritual power.

The one thing most clearly taught with respect to the "last times" is retribution for all sin. It is as lasting as the reward of the righteous. The heathen candidly admit their sinfulness, and as clearly feel the condemnation of their guilt. Now it is the doctrine of scripture that all men have a divine call to obedience, and to cease from sin and live unto righteousness. To the heathen it is first immediate, or indirect, through the light of nature: "For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse" (Rom. 1 : 21). This argument is expanded in the sermon on Mar's Hill, where natural knowledge of God acquired by reason and grace is shown to offer a direct call: "God

*See The Great Debate, 32.

hath made of one blood all nations and hath determined the times before appointed in the bounds of their habitation, that *they should seek the Lord*, if haply they should feel after him, *and if they should find him.*" St. Paul carries this argument one step farther. He argues (Rom. 2 : 15) that the Jews are under condemnation of the law, "for not the hearers of the law are just, but the doers of the law shall be justified." For if at any time the Gentiles without law should do the things of the law,—they although without law are a law unto themselves—they indeed show the law's effect, written in the heart, conscience being a witness. Hence, if the uncircumcised keep the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be regarded as circumcision?

If St. Paul opens a possibility for man by nature to do the things of the law, he has, to the contrary, effectually shut off this ideal consummation by pointing to man's real condition: "There is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law." "For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God."

Meyer, whom Dr. Stork often called the prince of exegetes, says on this passage that "St. Paul does not wish to prove a justification of the *Gentiles* really occurring as a *result* through the fulfilment of their natural law, but he desires simply to establish the *regulative principle* of justification through the law in the case of the Gentiles.

Real, actual justification by the law takes place neither among Jews nor Gentiles, because in no case is there a complete fulfilment, either, among the Jews, of the revealed law, or, among the Gentiles, of the natural—which in fact is only a substitute for the former, but at the same time forms the limit beyond which their responsibility and judgment cannot in principle go, because they have nothing higher."*

St. Paul explains further how this call is extended to the heathen, in Rom. 10 : 8f: It is by the word of faith which we preach; that if men will confess with the mouth the Lord Jesus, and will believe in the heart that God raised him from the

*On Romans, 90, 91.

dead, they will be saved. There is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich, unto all that call upon him. Whosoever then will call upon the name of the Lord will be saved. But a preacher must be sent that they may hear and believe. So, then, faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God. Have they not heard? Yes, verily, their sound went unto all the earth and their words unto the end of the world. So St. Paul inculcates a universal call through the word of God. Gerhard says it is universal, as to God who issues it, but it becomes special through the fault of man both on the part of those who reject it and of those by whose fault the lost word is not always in fact preached in all nations and places (463). Hutter says "God has revealed his word at least three times to the whole world. First, after the creation of the world, in the Adamitic Church. Then, after the deluge, in the house and family of Noah. Then, after the ascension of Christ to heaven, in the departure and dispersion of the apostles in the whole world," (Loc. com. 788).

This is not only the Pauline argument but it is the argument of all scripture, that there is salvation in no other way. The whole world is in self-conscious need of salvation, for the wrath of God is revealed against all iniquity. The apostles were enthusiasts but not fanatics, and, if ever men knew the mind and will of God, they did. St. Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles, would have preached the conditions of another method of the appropriation of redemption, if one existed in the councils of eternity. But it was not so revealed by word and spirit.

Yet some Christians in place of the revealed plan of salvation declare their preference, by light of reason, of course, for annihilation, probation, or universalism. In contrast to this sentimentalism hear the denunciations of God's word: "Ye know that ye were Gentiles carried away unto these dumb idols even as we were led. Wherefore I give you to understand that no man can say that Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Ghost" (1 Cor. 12 : 2). In Eph. 2 : 12 Paul says, "they are without Christ being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenant of promise, having no hope and without God in the world." In Gal. 5 : 19–21 he enumerates the works of the flesh

and declares that "they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." St. Paul must have made these catalogues of vices mainly from material gathered by observation in his missionary journeys. If the heathen engage in these works as he says they did, and as his successors say they do, we can read their doom: "The wicked shall be turned into hell and all the nations that forget God. Arise, O God; let not man prevail; let the heathen be judged in thy sight" (Ps. 9 : 19).

This world of ours *is* a heathen world for two reasons: the heathen resist the word and "the iniquity of the father is visited upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate Him;" and the Church has failed to send this word according to the divine command. If, in these circumstances, as Dr. Hawkins says, the majority of the pagans are not condemned, but saved, it must be because they are not sinners; if so, they are the only sinless people on the planet! Again, if this is true, the church sins in sending them the word which becomes a savor of death unto multitudes. If it is true that the heathen will have a better trial hereafter, the divine commission ought not be incentive enough to induce a man to endanger them when in perfect freedom from doom, for, then, God in his own time and way will save them.

But the effect of the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. If so, then, all to whom it first comes must be under condemnation. If, according to this scripture doctrine, *most* of the heathen are *not* saved, Dr. Hawkins is appalled at the overwhelming obligation resting upon the Church, and at the enormity of her guilt for dereliction of duty. It is humiliating, but let us be honest enough to confess the Church's apathy.

"Son of man, I have made thee a watchman unto the house of Israel: therefore hear the word of my mouth, and give them warning from me. When I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die; and thou givest not warning, nor speakest to warn the wicked from his wicked way, to save his life; the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity; but his blood shall I require at thine hand" (Ezek. 4 : 17, 18).

Surely it is glad tidings of great joy to carry to heathen lands the story of the cross, for, without it, none can be saved.

ARTICLE III.

THE WORK AND THE WORKERS
IN THE GENERAL SYNOD.

By E. J. Wolf, D. D., Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

The essential and specific work of the Christian Church is the preaching of the Gospel, in all the world, to every creature. A universal "Amen" must attest this proposition. And as the gospel of salvation cannot be preached without preachers, all Christians will readily admit that it is the foremost duty of the Church to furnish and equip the men who are to preach repentance and remission of sins among all nations. Whatever calling the Church may have besides, this comes first, and from this duty no congregation or individual believer can claim a release. Christ's teachings are too explicit on this point to be misunderstood, and the force of his conspicuous example, in sending forth early in his own ministry, first twelve, and soon thereafter seventy disciples, to preach the kingdom of God, must be felt wherever there is a desire to obey his authority, and not a mere habit of saying, Lord, Lord.

The apostles or first preachers along with the prophets constitute in a sense the foundation of the Church, Eph. 2 : 20, and this holds true, emphatically, of the Christian ministry in its relation to other departments of church work. The attempt at carrying forward the various agencies of Christian benevolence, while neglecting to make full provision first of all for the preaching of the Word, would be as preposterous a procedure as the endeavor to spring a bridge across a wide river without first putting down the piers and abutments needed to sustain the superstructure. At the base of all evangelical activity and missionary service lies the necessity of producing a ministry commensurate with the extent and requisites of the work. A certain proportion will always subsist between the workers and the work. If the former are inadequate to the latter, then the work will have to be dwarfed to the capacity of the workers. To own

more land than they could cultivate has usually brought farmers into bankruptcy.

It is noticeable, too, that zeal for the spread of the Gospel uniformly characterizes a revived Church. The surest fruit of spiritual quickening, the unmistakable test of a "revival" is the appearance of candidates for the holy office. So inseparably connected with a true church life is the increase of the ministry that ecclesiastical history shows at every important awakening this telling feature, revealing the Church's inward state as clearly as the heart's pulsations indicate the condition of the vital current. Kurtz, in speaking of the spontaneous and rapid multiplication of preachers during the reformation, adds, "When clergymen were wanting, mechanics and knights, even women and young maidens became missionaries. "A very large proportion of the young men who enter the theological seminary, in speaking of their religious experience declare that they received their first impulse to become ministers in a "revival." A dearth of ministers in a denomination, therefore, does not speak well for its present spirituality any more than it promises future prosperity. Congregations as well as individuals, when aglow with the fervor of the new life must find vent for the fire burning within by telling

"to others round
What a dear Saviour they have found."

And when churches moved by the quickening grace within them unite and combine their counsels and their efforts to do the Lord's work in the earth, the very first aim of their organization is to educate and prepare and send forth men to preach Christ. All the larger demoninations of this country showed what spirit was in them when they effected their general organizations and at once took steps for the founding of institutions, which should furnish trained laborers for the vineyard. The Methodists may form an exception. But their course only confirms this principle. They were so zealous in sending forth preachers and so many were ready to be sent that there was great reluctance to lose the time required for a complete education.

A passion for preaching the Gospel is the mark of a living Church. While all cannot personally enter this calling, and experience has demonstrated that a body of men is needed who will make this their vocation, earnest Christians who are themselves prevented from engaging in this noblest of all work will naturally and necessarily put forth their heartiest and best endeavors to have as many others as possible enlist in the blessed service. That this may be most certainly and most wisely effected, that the ministry may be multiplied and qualified to the fullest extent so that supply shall equal demand, has accordingly been the dominant motive in the organization of ecclesiastical bodies in this country and in the founding of literary institutions. But for this powerful incentive it may be a question, whether either churches or colleges would to-day bless our land.

The General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States owes its existence very largely to the conviction that organized efforts ought to be made for providing the Church with an adequate ministry. And among the very limited powers which the General body allowed itself was the authority to "devise plans for seminaries of education and missionary institutions." (Art. III, Sec. VII). And the very first committees appointed by the original convention that formed the General Synod in 1820, were, first, one "To form a plan for a seminary of education:

Pastor J. G. Schmucker,
Dr. Lochman,
Dr. Endress,
Pastor Geissenhainer,
Pastor Muhlenberg;"

and, secondly, one "To form a plan of a Missionary Institute:

Dr. Kurtz,
Pastor J. G. Schmucker,
Pastor D. F. Schaeffer,
Pastor B. Kurtz,
Pastor Reck."

The first committee reported to the next convention, in 1821,

that they found it inexpedient to establish a theological seminary at that juncture (the country was passing through a financial crisis) and advised the project to "be deferred for several years." They further declared their conviction "that after a lapse of several years, the establisment of such a seminary will not only be necessary, but with the aid of God feasible." The Synod also, at the instance of this committee, resolved "that seasonable preparations should be commenced in anticipation of so important an undertaking, viz.:

1.) That *it be made the duty of every minister in our connection to prepare the minds of the members of his congregation on this subject.*

2.) That arrangements ought to be made at an early day for the establishment of a well-selected and extensive library for the use of the seminary intended to be established."

Other resolutions in the same line were passed by this first regular convention, one to the effect that the several Synods should "nominate as teachers of certain special branches of theology, particular persons, and to recommend to them certain and suitable text-books and systems of each branch," &c. Another earnestly recommended "to the several synods to send, in the mean time, one or more missionaries to such parts of the country, as in their opinion may stand most in need of them."

At the third convention, in 1823, there was a very slim attendance, the Pennsylvania Synod having withdrawn and "several delegates being absent in consequence of indisposition." Very little business was transacted but a general address to "our several churches" was adopted in which occurs the following passage: "They have heard with feelings of the deepest interest the earnest calls of the children of the Church, and of others, resident on our frontier countries, to have the word of eternal life preached unto them; and have observed with regret that, in many instances no provision could be made to send to them the glad tidings of salvation: they would therefore invite the prayers of the Church to the Lord of the harvest, to raise up and qualify, and send forth many laborers in his harvest. * * * And especially they would exhort the several synods to perse-

vere in their evangelical habit of annually sending missionaries to preach the gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

That the zeal of the fathers did not spend itself in mere discussions and lamentations on this subject, appears from the minutes of the next convention, in 1825, from which is taken the following:

"The committee appointed to propose a plan for the establishment of a Theological Seminary, made their report, and after having been discussed and amended, was adopted, as follows, viz.:

"WHEREAS the General Synod regard it as *a solemn duty imposed on them by their Constitution, and due from them to their God and to the Church*, to provide for the proper education of men of piety and talents, for the Gospel ministry:—Therefore

"*Resolved*, that the General Synod will forthwith commence, in the name of the Triune God, and in humble reliance on his aid, the establishment of a theological seminary. * * And that in this seminary shall be taught * * the fundamental doctrines of the Sacred Scriptures, as contained in the Augsburg Confession."

An agent, Rev. B. Kurtz, was forthwith deputed to go to Europe "to solicit contributions of money and books, for the benefit of the seminary," a Board of Directors was appointed, a Professor elected, subscription books were opened, collecting agents were named and a pastoral address was issued calling upon the people to build up this institution "into an edifice which shall do honor to the liberality of your hearts, to make it commensurate with the wants of our extended Church, and to make it an important and efficient engine in the advancement of the mediatorial reign of the Redeemer."

In less than one year the project was consummated and the seminary at Gettysburg, which still bears the title of "The Theological Seminary of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church" stands as the monument of the zeal, wisdom and Christian energy of the founders of the General Synod. The spirit of Christ and of the Apostolic Church animated those men, and with that spirit they also possessed sufficient enlightenment to recognize the two conditions which are indispensable

to securing a ministry commensurate with the possibilities of a Church, namely: organized effort through the united counsels and co-operation of the whole Church, and the obligation of "*every minister*" of Christ "*to prepare the members of his congregation on this subject.*"

Relative to the successful founding of this institution, Dr. Morris in his History of the Seminary (QUART. REV. Vol. VI) says: "The wishes of the brethren had now been accomplished—their ardent expectations were realized,—they had long sighed, and lamented, and prayed, and hesitated—now in the Providence of God an institution was founded, and every one rejoiced in the glorious prospect which the Church had before her." Weak and poor as the Lutheran Church then was, they had now provided for the replenishing of the ministry, and in this way they felt sure that the slow growth, the languishing condition and the sporadic character of the denomination would give way to a better Church life. Their hopes were not disappointed. The establishment of a nursery for preachers was succeeded by a blooming period in the General Synod. This is a well known and significant fact. The reinforcement of the struggling little army resulted in notable triumphs everywhere. Zion experienced a revival of the true kind. A new era came upon Lutheranism.

The supplementary feature of procuring aid for indigent students came in due time, and by the organization of Education Societies a very considerable impetus was added to the cause of ministerial training and through it to the advancement of the Church.

Subsequently provision was made for general missionary and benevolent operations, such as Home and Foreign Missions, Church Extension, the Publication of denominational Literature, &c., the natural and scriptural order being followed, of first raising up the men and then giving them their work and their armor.

Whether this course has been faithfuly adhered to in the General Synod or whether the divine order of sustaining and spreading the Church has been virtually, perhaps unwittingly, reversed, will appear in the progress of this paper. A change does seem

to have taken place. While the Formula of Government, Chap. II, Part II, Sec. 4, still makes it the duty of every Church "to provide for the perpetuation of a faithful ministry able to teach," a notable relaxation of interest and effort on this subject has for years been manifest in our public counsels, and while the most strenuous and successful efforts are put forth in other spheres of activity, the work of increasing the ministry has been pushed aside, has in effect dropped out of view. This is a most lamentable revelation, and the most deplorable aspect about it is that so few seem to recognize it. A lukewarmness like that of Laodicea seems on this vital matter to have fallen on the churches represented in the General Synod. The gravest moral delinquency stares them in the face, and the worst of it is, they are satisfied to have it so.

When did we have anything like an energetic discussion of this subject before the General body, on the floor of district Synods, or in the denominational press? The subject came up indirectly at Harrisburg, in 1885, through a resolution in the report of the Board of Home Missions, but when or where in the last fifteen years did it come up on its own merits, as an independent and most important factor of Church work? The district Synods give at their annual sessions some attention to beneficiary education, sometimes by way of attacking it, but, as intimated above, this is at best but a supplementary phase of this great duty, and the interest even in this has seriously declined. Twenty years ago the contributions of large and liberal congregations were wont to be equally divided between Beneficiary Education, Home and Foreign Missions. If either cause had the preference, it was the first one, that being deemed fundamental to the others. Examine now the parochial reports of these churches and with scarce an exception that cause which used to be first has come to be last, neither pastors nor churches having any enthusiasm over it.

What has been done in the last fifteen years to improve the status of theological education? What addition has been made to the libraries? What increase to the teaching force? or to the number of students? What enlargement of the endowment funds? The solitary movement towards any substantial im-

provement was the voluntary proposition, on the part of a devoted and wide-awake divine, to raise the money for a fourth Professorship at the Gettysburg Seminary. He soon found rich men ready to respond and could without doubt have raised a sufficient amount; but the temper ruling in the Church seemed to look with disfavor on the project and it was accordingly suspended. There appears to be a wide-spread feeling that in this department no more need be done for the present. We have actually stopped, content with what we have. For, who amongst us thinks of a forward movement in theological education? Who judges one called for? It is about time that we read on this point Rev. 3 : 17.

Notice over against this apathy the enlarged, liberal and continuous aggression in other departments. What organization, what enthusiasm, what appeals, what responses, what extraordinary strides are being made!

The first day following the organization of the General Synod is occupied with Foreign Missions, the second with Home Missions, the third with Church Extension, the fourth with the meeting of the Publication Society. The General body is absolutely engrossed by these other causes, for even if some day were set later for the consideration of this object, it is useless to attempt the agitation of any vital subject after such an assembly has been on a strain for a week. The working members are tired out, the idle ones have lost interest. Evidently the General Synod is, in these days, not an institution "to provide for the perpetuation of a faithful ministry," maugre the language of its own Formula.

Then, these other benevolent operations are entrusted to Boards constituted of earnest and able men, who meet regularly once a month to attend to their trust. Each of them employs the entire time and services of one or more secretaries, who look after every feature of the work from day to day, who keep their respective interests before the whole Church, who go from Synod to Synod and from congregation to congregation to stimulate and enlarge the cause given into their hands; wide-awake men who are abroad in the land, who have the free use of the press, and who the moment any flagging of interest or decrease of

contributions is apparent are out with their stirring appeals and determined to keep the Church up to the standard. Even a special monthly journal has been founded in which every branch of Church-work except the fundamental one has a distinct department, by which public interest is sought to be kept at white heat.

It may be that our very activity in other spheres has induced a measure of apathy on the supply of the ministry. It is quite common for men to be so absorbed in one pursuit as to become delinquent in others equally important. Any observer at the General Synod may readily find in this the explanation for the fact, that a body which formerly made the increase of ministers its primary function has now rarely either time or inclination to give this subject consideration. But surely this need not be so. Such is the harmony and correlative relation between all branches of activity in the Church that zeal in one direction ought to promote the greater zeal in another, and the more that is done in devising ways and means for missionary and other benevolent operations, the more, in the nature of things, ought we to feel called upon to multiply the men required to conduct these operations. A government intent on a career of conquest will not be so engrossed with the building of vessels, the manufacture of arms and the provision of all the munitions of war as to forget that the primary necessity will be for sailors and soldiers to man the ships and to fight the battles. But this is the very thing we have been doing as a Church. Realizing the mission of Christianity to conquer the world we have of late developed marked activity in planning campaigns, in extending our lines, in erecting fortifications, in occupying advantageous positions, in providing the sinews of war, while scarcely giving a thought to the reinforcement of our little army, which never yet has been strong enough even to hold its beleaguered walls, and which with all its shouting of "feste Burg" has rarely gotten beyond defensive warfare.

The growth of activity in other branches of Church work has been very considerable; encouraging progress has been made in the last twenty years, the increase of liberality has been wonderful, the whole Church has rallied around those causes which

have been specially emphasized and continuously kept before the public, and the people have shown both the will and the ability to provide all the means needed to carry forward these ever-widening interests.

The minutes of the General Synod, which met at Dayton in 1871, show, for instance, the receipt of the Foreign Mission Board for two years to have amounted to $14,409.70. This Board reported at Harrisburg in 1885 the receipt of $60,576.72 for the two years covered by their report, an increase of over four hundred per cent. At Dayton the Treasurer's Report for Home Missions showed a total of $23,063.79 for two years, at Harrisburg the sum of $54,311.33 for something less than two years, an increase of more than two hundred per cent. At Dayton the Treasurer of the Church Extension fund reported the receipt of $5,927.47 for the biennium then expired, at Harrisburg $71,891.02, an increase of nearly fourteen hundred per cent. At Dayton the Publication Society declared the net Capital Stock to be $24,895.15; fifteen years later at Harrisburg we read: *Net Assets*, $68,083.91, a gain of nearly three hundred per cent. At the former convention $576.00 were collected in aid of the Society, at the latter it reported a donation of $6000.00 from its treasury to the various Church Boards.

Agitation, organization, zealous endeavors on the part of secretaries, Boards, Church papers and pastors, have yielded results over which the whole Church has gratefully rejoiced.

But where in all this time has any perceptible advance been made in filling up the gaps in our ministry? What solitary indication can be pointed to that will show during this period any improvement at this most vital point? Can our theological institutions reveal in any respect one step of progress? We are standing still. Aggregate the number of students in our theological seminaries and it is doubtful whether they show an increase of one. (Quite recently the applicants for beneficiary aid have multiplied, but the seminaries can not as yet show the results of this). Families of wealth and culture abound among us, but how many have been led to feel sufficient interest on this point to consecrate their own sons to the holy office? Men

who give by the hundred or even thousand in support of missions appear to have neither heart nor conscience on the matter of giving their sons to this work. Large congregations which send annually very generous contributions to the respective Boards, have in twenty-five years, some in fifty years, not furnished a single candidate for orders—and they appear to have no compunctions of spirit, no sense of humiliation over it. They are but a part of the general current, they share the general obtuse consciousness that missions are everything, the providing of missionaries nothing. Fields of work are most important, never mind about the workmen. Make up the trains, all aboard! engineers and conductors will doubtless turn up before we get very far!

Is this a mere jeremiad? Is the writer a pessimist? Face the figures. Look, if you can, at our scale of progress in filling up the ranks. According to Stall's Lutheran Year-Book the General Synod in 1877, numbered 812 ministers, in 1885 the clerical roll was increase to 866, making a net gain of 54 preachers in nine years! An average of 6 men per year added during that time to the effective force of the whole General Synod!! Perhaps "effective" gain is putting it too strongly. Deducting the deaths and adding the new men, the roll was swelled from 812 to 866 in nine years, but those who in the mean time became superannuated or for any reason dropped out of active service, are of course continued on the ministerial register, making it quite doubtful whether the General Synod really had a gain of 54 men in active duty during nine years, or 6 in one year.

It is to be hoped that the reader will pause here and take in as far as he can the import of these portentous figures. When, at this rate, will we occupy "the immense field" that lies open to us? When, with this showing to back us, will we plant our standard in all the important centres of the west? When, with such a record, will we anglicise the vast immigrant population that only needs a Lutheran shepherd to be brought into the Lutheran fold? When will we reinforce our struggling little company beyond the seas—where death keeps reducing the number, as fast as we succeed in increasing it? Is it a wonder,

notwithstanding the shame of it, that the Foreign Board after keeping in the Journal a standing notice for years—"Three men wanted for the Foreign field"—have not yet found even this small number of missionary recruits? Is it a wonder, notwithstanding the shame of it, that the devoted brother Day must continue to toil solitary and alone on the African Coast, in spite of the unnatural character of such an isolation and the long-continued appeals for an assistant.

Not a man can really be spared to go to Africa, India, or our own frontier. Our charges in the old fields, long ago established, are increasing more rapidly than the pastors to serve them, and unless these old churches are to be abandoned for a time or indefinitely, it is under present circumstances preposterous to send missionaries into new fields. Look at some more figures. The main strength of the General Synod, the old and settled portion of the country embraced within its bounds, lies in the States of Maryland and Pennsylvania. During the nine years that witnessed an increase of 54 ministers in the entire body, the seven synods comprised in these two states show an increase of 55 pastoral districts. Thus the old territory in two States occupied long ago, alone required for its charges 55 additional laborers, when the whole body furnished only 54 of all qualities, to be employed in 38 states and 10 territories and the missionary fields of Asia and Africa. The whole body came within one of producing just enough additions to the ministry to supply the churches waiting for them in Pennsylvania and Maryland alone. *And certainly the call for additional workers is less urgent in Pennsylvania and Maryland than in any other state of the Union.* The need for more laborers here bears no comparison to that which exists in a score of other states. But whence are to come the laborers for the immense and ever-widening harvest? How is it possible, without such a ratio of increase as has never been thought of heretofore, to make any advance whatever?* Unless

*Doubtless the large majority of the accessions to the ministry are called immediately to fields in these two States and the adjoining state of Ohio. And, including the few students that hail from New York, New Jersey and the South, it is these few states that supply almost the entire additions to the ministerial roll. If the General Synod has in all the states west of

precedence be once more given by the Church to the cause which God puts first, unless we begin to observe the law of proportion and devote our greatest energy to the point which most needs it, every other cause is in turn bound to languish. Just here has always been the salient and glaring weakness of English Lutheranism. City after city and point after point have been lost, simply for want of qualified men to enter into open doors. And the stereotyped lament of the Home Missionary Secretaries, ever since there exists such an office, has been "if we only had the men!" The lament has been repeated so often that it no longer attracts attention. Without a ministry bearing some proportion to the work, a feeling of impotence has largely swayed the Church, and we have inevitably fallen behind, like a team on the road, whose master attempts with two horses to drag a burden that requires twice or four times the horse-power at his command.

The consciousness of our inability to compass more than the smallest fraction of the work that might be done with sufficient workmen, impairs very largely even that measure which is being done. No man can have the spirit needed for the best endeavor and the highest success, who is weighed down with the feeling that whatever he may attempt, an enormous portion of the work must remain unaccomplished and the brightest opportunities be forfeited. The recent record of our Home Missions and our

---

Ohio 12 candidates in course of preparation, the fact is unknown in the east. It *is* known that whole synods have not a single one. Money collected in one western synod for the beneficiary fund was some time ago offered to Gettysburg, where it was hoped young men could be found to whom it might be appropriated. With all that portion of the Church doing practically nothing, and all the rest not doing enough to make up losses and to occupy new organizations and new districts in Pennsylvania and Maryland, is there a human possibility of building up the English Lutheran Church in the great west! There can be no justification in keeping these startling facts from the light of day. It is not likely that our neighbors will take them up in order to concentrate reproach on the General Synod. There would be no occasion for envy if the Council could offer a better showing in its English work. But as long as less than half a dozen English organizations represent that body west of Indiana, it would be rather ungracious for any one from that quarter to charge us with being sinners above all the Lutherans.

Church Extension, encouraging as it is, would have been written in more glowing colors but for the paralyzing consciousness that with our scant ministerial force it is impossible to make any substantial advance. Oppressed by this incubus, enthusiasm is quenched, courage depressed, faith is enervated, liberality checked. By the very grandeur of a prospect which they feel impotent to seize our people are disheartened and unnerved. Should you ask half-a-score of reapers to harvest a thousand-acre field, you may depend on it, they would shoulder their sickles and return to their homes. Something like this is what is expected to be done by an extremely limited number of Lutheran ministers.

It is evident from the above figures that this disproportion of the workers to the work is every year growing larger, and that we are becoming less and less capable of seizing our opportunity and meeting our responsibility. If the General Synod had not a sufficient body of ministers in 1877, then the relative deficiency in 1885 must be far greater, for the net increase within the whole Church is less by one than the increase of pastorates in two states alone, and with the immense multiplication of opportunities all over the west, not a man is left over to go to the front. Every soldier is required to guard the capitol, where then is the army to march out against the mighty foe. Every man sent to the front make a drain upon the strength needed at home. You cannot in the present situation throw forward a force of missionaries without exposing the base of supplies. It is impossible with our feeble numbers to occupy new positions and at the same time hold and properly strengthen the old ones. Infinite demoralization and disaster overtake the old churches which are left unsupplied by the removal of the most efficient pastors to mission fields. Who has not been most painfully impressed by observing this fact! Notice the parochial reports at synod. How many are careful to apologize for the melancholy figures with such phrases as "this is only for half the year," "the report covers only two months," "the pastor took charge but a month ago." Some have no report at all. They were vacant through the whole year. There is nothing to report. Ah! yes there is much to report. Not only a failure to do any-

thing for the spread of the kingdom, but a very serious decline, the falling away of many, and a large increase of worldliness and ungodliness, requiring many years to recover what has been lost.

It is a legitimate question whether under these painful circumstances it is worth the while to be exploring new places in which to plant Lutheran churches. Our Home missionaries often speak of their readiness to develop certain contiguous points where there are good prospects for starting a new organization, but they justly recoil from the undertaking, because they know in advance that men can not be provided to take charge of them. And when the secretaries come to the synods with their glowing reports of the vastness of the field, and name the scores of towns and cities that are waiting for the bread of life at our hands, they simply appal and overwhelm us. In answer to a recent statement by the Western secretary that there are "ONE THOUSAND OTHER OPENINGS," we can only cry, O Lord, how long! It is not the poverty or penuriousness of the Church that forbids any earnest attempt to take possession of these places for the Master. The people will provide the money needed for every mission that is properly manned. They have done so heretofore—at St. Louis, Chicago, Denver and other places. All that was asked for was in due time forthcoming. They will do so again. Select your city, appoint a missionary who commands their confidence, and the means for support will be found. But unless in this age of invention you have found machinery to take the place of workmen in the pulpit, we might as well abandon the business of founding missions and building churches, until we see some earnest movement toward raising up and qualifying sufficient laborers to do the work for which missions are founded and churches built. It is, to say the least, not business to continue what has been for years the practice of the Church. And it is a wonder that intelligent business men have not pointed out the error of this procedure.

But we dare not discontinue the benevolent operations for which the Church was instituted. We dare not do less than we have been doing in the cause of missions. The Head of the Church will spew us from his mouth if we content ourselves

with what has been done. "Forward," is the command. "Into all the earth," is our marching order. A church cannot live, it is no church, if it be not active in missionary and all benevolent work. But let us go to the root of the tree. Let us pray like souls that are in earnest for laborers to be sent into the harvest. These things ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone.

And this is a work that can be done. There is no excuse for dereliction here. Hundreds upon hundreds of men are found in our churches who are capable of becoming preachers. Many of the foremost divines among the Baptists and Episcopalians have entered the pulpit from the bar and from other professions, and among the Lutheran laymen there are numbers who might become most effective preachers of Christ. What warrant have we for confining the recruiting of the ministry to our present inadequate system? When was the divine call restricted to young men?

There may be a limit to the Church's capacity to raise funds and occasions may arise—though this is doubtful—where a most promising project must be declined because the means for its support can absolutely not be obtained, but there is no reason except that of wicked indifference why our seminaries should not graduate one hundred students each year, instead of an average scarcely above fifteen. Not circumstances beyond our control, not providential barriers, are chargeable with the deplorable result, but worldliness, selfishness and an astonishing indifference touching the most vital work of Christianity. The only possible defense that can be thought of is, that we have been so occupied with other branches of activity as to overlook the main one. We have been reversing the order of nature. We have acted as if wiser than God and as if we were making an improvement upon his methods.

Now, as the fruits of our misdoing appear let them be followed with true repentance, with a sincere change of mind and a change of conduct. Let ministerial education come once more to the front. Let the principal work of the Church again receive the principal attention. Whatever be the rich prospects that open to our view in Kansas, Nebraska, India or elsewhere,

let it be understood that so long as the men are not here to make them realities, these prospects are but the illusory *mirage* of the desert. It is not new openings that we need, not new territory to be held, not new ships of war to bombard the strongholds of sin, but *an army of occupation.*

Let then the first working-day of the General Synod be devoted to the burning question of reinforcing the ministry. No change of Constitution is necessary and the "Order of Business" will appear more in harmony with the nature of things when this subject is made the first "special order." Let the District Synods realize that no question of equal importance can possibly engage their attention, and that it is for them to help and not to hinder all true men who offer themselves for the service. Let pastors recognize the very solemn relation of their work to this cause, and ponder the comparison between ministers who have multiplied themselves ten or twenty fold and those who have never brought another into the office. Let congregations realize that the first obligation devolving on them is to send out from their midst men who shall preach also to others that gospel which they possess. Yes, let it be pressed on their conscience that there is no surer nor sadder proof of the spiritual torpor and death of a church, than its failure for years and years to bring forth a single minister of Christ. Let them be made to feel that whatever may be the outward strength of a congregation, it must wither under the divine curse if in this matter it come not to the help of the Lord against the mighty. A community of citizens who view as idle spectators the progress of a war, whose results they expect to share but for whose battles they never contribute a soldier, would be proscribed by the government. And can Heaven smile on a community of Christians animated by no better principle? Finally, let parents and especially mothers come to know what claims the Lord that bought them has upon their sons, and what base ingraittude it is for them to withhold a son from the highest and most honorable service of Him, who gave his only-begotten to the lowest and bitterest service for them! Instead of it being no one's duty in particular to see to this matter, let it be made the duty of every one individually and of every organization, congrega-

tional and synodical. Let pressure be brought to bear upon every part and portion of the Church, and importunate and universal prayer ascend to the source of all supply, and an impulse will be given to the prosperity of Zion, such as the English Lutheran Church has never before known. Let us undertake great things and great things will be accomplished, especially if we begin at the right place, where God begins, where the General Synod began, in building up and filling up institutions charged with the duty of providing the Church with a competent and ample ministry.

It is hardly just to close this paper without any allusion to the sad anomaly of having a number of ministers who fail to find employment, while yet every department of the Church is suffering and has always been suffering from a serious destitution in the holy office. This is a problem so delicate to handle and surrounded with such painful and perplexing circumstances that few men have the courage to write about it over their own signature. It is a serious question whether the fault lies with the pastoral charges, or with the preachers who are without charges. Perhaps, in many cases it is nearly equally divided between both parties. With a profound sympathy for brethren who are out of labor and therefore out of bread, the writer has interested himself to the point of officiousness in trying to secure fields for such ministers, but almost without exception these brethren have proven, either from choice or necessity, singularly fastidious as to the character of the field they would serve. Either they could not or would not serve any charge, unless it was constituted of a given number of churches, unless it lay in a particular locality, had a favorable climate, and a certain amount of advantages. And, while recoiling from the thought of wounding his humblest brother, the writer feels, in justice to the truth, constrained to say that for a minister who is willing to go anywhere, and who is willing and able to labor in any and every kind of a field, a pastoral charge can certainly be found somewhere in a Church that unhappily abounds in destitute districts.

But certainly no one will seriously claim that efforts for the

increase of the active ministry must not be intensified until places are found for those now inactive. The very number of the inactive is a powerful argument for increasing the effective force. If the total of all classes of our ministry number but 910, and a considerable number of these are without charges, then the number of laborers is that much smaller than appears in our statistics, and the duty becomes the more imperative to make a vigorous forward movement in raising up reapers to gather the whitening harvest.

ARTICLE IV.

THE FINAL JUDGMENT.

By Prof. L. A. Fox, D. D., Roanoke College, Salem, Va.

"The New Theology recognizes the necessity of a restatement of belief in eschatology, or the doctrine of the Last Things." With these words one of the ablest advocates of the new movement in theology introduces his discussion of one of its chief characteristics. Not merely the doctrine of probation after death, around which the battle has been fought for several years, but those of the resurrection, Christ's second advent and the final judgment also are to be restated.

The challenge for a new study of these doctrines is not in itself objectionable. It is not to be neglected. Dead conservatism and indolence may shrink from it. They may ask sneeringly, Is nothing to be considered settled? They may attempt to ignore it. But earnest, honest thought is not to be refuted by sneers nor stopped by our assumed indifference. Radical changes often win because the old, relying too much upon the fact of possession, refuses or neglects to meet the new in fair and free discussion. Truth never loses when brought out into clear light. If there is truth in the New Theology it should be recognized and incorporated with the old systems. If the old theology is better, let it be brought forward again and placed by the side of the new that the world may see clearly the difference and make a more intelligent and positive choice.

The demand in our age for a new Theology is not a matter of surprise. Many old sciences are being recast. We have a new Chemistry. We are promised a new Psychology. A call is being made for a new Political Economy. Geology and Biology are new sciences. Many new facts, related in a greater or less degree to religion, have been brought out by science and criticism. The theological importance of many of these facts has not been carefully determined, and they have an exaggerated significance in the public mind. In many quarters it is thought that the old orthodoxy must be abandoned and a wholly new system of faith must be moulded to suit the wants of our enlightened period. The New Theology is by no means as radical as many suppose, nor as closely connected with the recent scientific discoveries as is generally believed, yet it does propose important changes and professes a closer relation to modern science than the old systems. It is in some degree a response to the call of the age. The friends of the old systems cannot decline the challenge for the new study. The earnest, devout, able and, in great part, orthodox men who make it in the name of the new movement, deserve respect. A profound and reverent and truth-loving study of the points in dispute, under the light of the present, must have some good results. President Noah Porter says, "If theology as a science is to a large extent constituted of elements derived from philosophy on the one side and criticism on the other, then as these sciences are perfected theology itself must inevitably change and change for the better."

But it may be asserted without seeming to prejudice the issue, that much of the popular expectation will not be realized. This is evident, first, because the new scientific facts affect theology almost exclusively in the department of apologetics. In this there has been only a change of disputed points. Some old difficulties have been removed and new ones created. The greater part of the old evidences are as valid as ever. Dogmatic Theology, with which the New Theology is concerned, is governed chiefly by Biblical criticism. "The demands of the age," as Dr. Munger uses it in his justification of the new movement, means a growing liberalism, a broader idea of humanity and its relations, but these demands must be subordinated to the Scrip-

tures. True theology does not ask, What do men think? but, What does God teach? The sciences have been changed because new facts have necessitated changes of theories. New fields have been opened. New instruments of observation have been invented. New methods have been employed. But the field of theology remains the same. We have no new Bible. We have a little better textual criticism and some archæological investigations which help us to understand somewhat better certain scriptural statements. But neither has been clearly enough established to be used extensively in theological study. As a result of criticism we have the New Version which has not won anything like universal favor among scholars. But even if accepted, very few doctrines would need any modification whatever. Criticism and research are respectively correcting themselves. The Tübingen school has receded from many of its first conclusions, and this illustrates the general tendency.

Another reason for the opinion that the popular expectation will not be met is, that it is based upon sweeping inductions. One of the great sources of error is illegitimate induction. A fact is announced, and even before verification men rush to conclusions. Cullen says, "There are more false facts current in the world than false theories." When facts have been established, unwarranted inferences are drawn. How often has Christianity been supposed to be undermined! Promises are made in the line of the wishes of men, and they persuade themselves that the end is realized. "Quae volunt sapiunt, et nolunt sapere quae vera sunt." So when a strong point is made against one of the old systems it is thought that they have all alike been utterly demolished. It must be remembered also that there is a Lutheran theology, and if the Calvinistic be overthrown the Lutheran still stands. If the Church has modified its view of infant salvation it does not follow, as sometimes seems to be inferred, that it will come to accept the doctrine of probation after death.

To be correct in our estimate of the New Theology and fair in our discussion of any of its points we must remember that it professes to be "only a movement." Its views are undergoing important changes. It is a name that marks lines of investigation and methods of study rather than fixed results. It must

be remembered also that it exists in orthodox churches. The Unitarians, for manifest reasons, regard it very favorably, yet its advocates claim "no sympathy with those who do not walk the one way." In some points the two approximate, yet they must be regarded as distinct. There is a rationalizing tendency and the influence of Rationalism may be observed, yet the leaders and abettors are not Rationalists.

One of the chief difficulties of the discussion seems to lie in the want of a clear understanding as to the authority by which the questions shall be decided. Both parties appeal to the Scriptures. But is there an agreement as to the nature of these Scriptures? Is the Bible God's book, a revelation from God, or is it a human record of revelation? Is it inspired, or is it a human production? Is its authority ultimate? If the principle of interpretation, now so familiar to the public ear—"as God gives us light"—be applied to the Scriptures as it is to a creed, we have a wide open door for divergence. The New Theology weakens further this appeal to the Scriptures by its "claim for itself of a somewhat larger and broader use of the reason than has been accorded to theology." (Munger). Reason is explained as the full exercise of our nature which embraces the intuitions, the conscience, the susceptibilities, *i. e.* man's whole inner being. It will not be easy to determine under this "broader use" just to what extent reason may decide points of doctrine.

We are concerned in this article with the authority in regard to questions in eschatology. Shall the final appeal be made to the Scriptures, or the general Christian consciousness, or reason? Shall the restatement be made because the New Version requires it? If true criticism has proven that the old proof texts had been misunderstood, the modifications of the old doctrine must be made. But the work of the revisers needs examination. The general Christian consciousness is not sufficiently definite to be a safe or an accessible tribunal. Schleiermacher's theology makes us afraid of it. The demands of the age cannot be ultimate. We allow them no authority until we know whence they come. We know that public opinion is often hearty and that the current of thought often changes rapidly. Many books five years old are out of date. The demands of to-day may not be

made a few years hence, but truth does not change. Reason must apprehend but it cannot limit the sphere of doctrine. There are many things which it cannot comprehend. He would be a poor deity whom reason could measure. We find boundaries on every side beyond which we cannot pass. God's ways are past finding out. We have no satisfactory explanation of sin. If we had speculated we should have pronounced evil impossible. We would have proposed different methods of government from those we find. Until we can comprehend God and his eternal plans reason must be humble in its speculations. We are inclined to forget the impotence of reason. Mansel's Limits of Religious Thought is a good book for our age when read with discrimination. Reason transcends its sphere when it attempts to forecast the facts of the last times. Eschatology is eminently Biblical. Without the Scriptures we are not sure that there will be any subsequent life. In depreciating the authority of the Bible we weaken the very ground on which we stand. We must be sure that we have the very words of God or we are left in great uncertainty.

Our view of the last times is determined in some measure by our conception of God's relation to the world. The New Theology emphasizes the Fatherhood of God. This may be well enough in opposition to the Sovereignty of God as taught by Calvin and Knox. Calvin's God filled us with awe and made us bow with a certain profound reverence but failed to secure our love. He was a God who made, even as Calvinists admitted, dreadful decrees. We were held off at a great distance and never could realize in him the father falling upon the neck of the returning prodigal and kissing him. In the Calvinistic systems the paternal side of God's character was not put in its proper place. But the New Theology errs as seriously on the opposite side. It overlooks the fact that God is a sovereign as well as a father. Take this as a specimen of its reasoning: "No father says to his children, 'You have a chance; it shall be fair; I will not be hard with you; it will last just so long; if you do not meet the test you may go your own way.' It is, indeed, possible that in a desperate exigency of family-life a father might be forced to say this, but it is not in such guise that a wise and

tender parent presents himself to his children. As little is it the aspect of the Heavenly Father before men." (Freedom of Faith). True, no human father deals thus with his children because he is head of a family only. The children are born with the spirit of loyalty, but men are born at enmity with God and cannot be treated as children. The father is ruler in a very small circle, but God's scepter is over worlds. Human parents becoming rulers of a nation must in official relations change the attitude towards their children. Brutus, the elder, condemning his own traitorous sons and witnessing the execution, according to the legend, may have carried the principle to an extreme but yet he serves to illustrate it. As a father God may have no need of a final judgment but if he is a sovereign there are sufficient reasons for it.

The Scriptures teach no less clearly and fully God's sovereignty than his fatherhood. "Thine is the kingdom, O Lord, and thou art exalted as head above all." (1 Chron. 29 : 11). "All the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing and he doeth according to his will in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth: and none can stay his hand or say unto him, What doest thou?" (Dan. 4 : 35). "Our God is in the heavens; he hath done whatsoever he pleased." (Ps. 115 : 3). "Now unto the king eternal, incorruptible, invisible, the only God." (1 Tim. 1 : 7). These are only a few of the passages teaching a natural sovereignty or kingdom founded upon the rights of creation. The kingdom of grace is based upon the natural kingdom. It is God's scheme of restoring to its place in the eternal kingdom that portion that had become perverted through sin. Over this kingdom Christ is sovereign. He claimed to be a king. "My kingdom is not of this world." "Pilate therefore said unto him, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am king." (John 17 : 33, 35, 37). For the better administration of this kingdom he has been invested with universal authority. "All authority hath been given to me in heaven and on earth." (Matt. 28 : 18). "And made him (Christ) to sit at his right hand in the heavenly places far above all rule and authority and power and dominion and every name that is named, not only in this world (or age) but also in

that which is to come; and he put all things in subjection under his feet and gave him to be head of all things to the Church." (Eph. 1 : 21, 22). "In him ye are made full who is the head of all principality and power." (Col. 2 : 10). "He must reign till he hath put all his enemies under his feet." "When he saith, All things are put in subjection, it is evident that he is excepted who did subject all things unto him." (1 Cor. 15 : 25, 27). Both as the Head of the Church and as Lord over all he will judge the world.

It it somewhat difficult to gather just what the New Theology holds as to the Last Judgment. It does not appear to have fully developed its doctrine, but we can determine the trend of its opinions. "It holds to judgment as involved in the development of moral character." "We are all the while rendering account to the laws within and without; we are all the while undergoing judgment and receiving sentence of acquittal or condemnation. It does not follow, however, that because judgment is drawn forward into this world from the next that it is confined to this world. Great moral laws have universal sweep. Instead of confining judgments to the future, we take it out of time-relations and make it a fact of eternity. It is ever an on-going process. Conduct is always reaching crises and entering upon its consequences. It may be cumulative in degree and reach crises more and more marked; it may at last reach a special crisis which shall be *the* judgment when the soul shall turn to the right or left of eternal destiny." (Freedom of Truth, p. 341). The old theology is charged with weakness because it "arbitrarily transfers the most august and moving features of God's moral government to a future world, thus placing the wide and mysterious gulf of time and death between actions and their motives." "Judgment is a constantly recurring crisis." "The true substance of judgment is to be sought in subjective moral conditions, and not in external governmental arrangements." (Do., p. 339). "We are to think of the Judgment not as an *event* limited to a specific 'day' but as a *process* which runs its course throughout the whole existence of the responsible subjects of law." (Whiton, Gospel of the Resurrection).* According to

*The *Andover Review* has given forth no clear expression on the doc-

this doctrine there is to be no general judgment or last day but crises to individuals occurring in the changes in personal history; no event but a mere process in individual character. In this doctrine the New Theology and the more conservative Unitarianism are very closely related if not identical.

The arraignment of the old doctrine is wrong. The old theology taught that there are judgments in this world and that sometimes final judgments are pronounced. It taught the possibility of sinning unto death. The sin against the Holy Ghost was made prominent enough to be practically influential, and every pastor has been called often to decide great perplexities and remove fears on account of it. People were so often warned against grieving away the Spirit lest he cease to strive with them that it became one of the platitudes of the pulpit. If the old theology drew additional motives from the future life it followed the Great Preacher. "It is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish and not thy whole body go into hell." "And be not afraid of them which kill the body but are not able to kill the soul, but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." As long as men believe in future retribution and a great day of judgment, though death does intervene, they find in that faith a powerful motive.

Finality in character does not exhaust the scriptural idea of judgment. The new doctrine confounds fact and decision based

---

trine of the final judgment. In Vol. IV. there is an editorial on eschatology in which there is a very brief discussion of the fact and principle of judgment, but the purpose of the editor did not lead him to state his opinion on the points under consideration in this article. Old orthodoxy can subscribe his language so far as it goes but still will want a more explicit statement: "Predictions of the future carry us on to the day of judgment as the time when the consummation of the gospel will be accomplished. Then the destiny of men will be irrevocably fixed. It will be the final crisis for the human race. Whatever may be the decisive point in time for individuals this is unquestionably represented as the crisis for humanity as a whole under the gospel. The first advent of Christ was unto salvation. The second advent is unto judgment and victory." "We are now emphasizing the fact as one of the most evident in the scriptural teaching that the day of judgment—the second coming of Christ—is the final and supreme crisis for the human race."

on the fact. The fact of a murder is not the same thing as the verdict of a jury. The character of man may become fixed in this life, or in death, or possibly in the life to come, but that is quite a different thing from the judgment of God. The one is man's own act; the other is God's decision.

The new doctrine, founded upon the idea of the fatherhood of God, fails to comprehend the great purposes of the final judgment.

The last edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica gives us "advanced thought" on religious subjects. We have this thought on the final judgment in the article on Eschatology, written by Rev. A. S. Allen. He says: "There are two distinct methods of treatment of these difficult subjects. In the philosophy of them we meet the ever recurrent antagonism between the Platonic and Aristotelian systems." "The New Testament itself discloses two entirely different eschatalogical methods. The one is moral, spiritual, idealist, employing outward forms only as symbols, viewing the future rather in regard to development of character than as a mode of existence. This is the Christian as contrasted with the Jewish method. The other follows the natural tendency of Jewish thought. It is literal, material, sensuous. It delights in chronological arrangements of the unknown future, and topographical arrangements of the unseen world. This method aims in all its representations at abrupt catastrophe and at a consummation depending on startling and supernatural surprises. These distinctive tendencies appear within the New Testament most prominently—the one in the fourth gospel and the other in the Apocalypse. The Pauline theology exhibits them side by side, showing their discordance in the absence of all attempt on the part of the apostle to reconcile. This is seen in his treatment of the resurrection. The same discordance is observable in his treatment of the judgment and of the end of the world." The more orthodox part of the friends of the New Theology may not endorse a part of the language of Mr. Allen, but their fundamental idea of the judgment is the same.

That there is any discordance between a spiritual development and a consummation attended by startling supernatural mani-

festations, not only Paul, but also John and Christ failed to see. They all three teach both, without any attempt to reconcile them. Christ teaches the one in the parable of the leaven and the other in the parable of the net. If the symbolism of the net must set aside its plain teaching why not the symbolism of the leaven? Christ teaches the moral, spiritual influence of the Spirit when he compares it to wind, and he taught the disciples to look for the startling and supernatural baptism which they received at Pentecost. He said that the kingdom of heaven comes without observation, but he foretold also the destruction of Jerusalem in language that strongly suggests the startling and supernatural. Our theories ought to conform to the Scriptures—the Scriptures must not be strained and perverted to meet our theories. Gradual development that ends in marked consummations is not without analogies in nature, history and common life. Silent forces culminate in the earthquake. Poisons, operating quietly, suddenly reveal themselves in epidemics. The forces had long been developing that broke forth in the French Revolution. The undergraduate develops intellectually and morally, passes his final examination, and on Commencement day receives the bachelor's crown. We see—the difficulty is in the supernatural, for to modern thought that is almost impossible with Almighty God.

There are different words in the Scriptures translated judgment, and there are different kinds of judgment taught. Sometimes judgment has the sense of opinion. "But that ye be perfected in the same mind and in the same judgment." (1 Cor. 1 : 10). Sometimes it is used in the sense of punishments. "Thus will I execute judgments." "When I send my four sore judgments upon Jerusalem, the sword and the famine and the noisome beast and the pestilence." (Ez. 30 : 19 and 14 : 21). "In one hour are thy judgments come." (Rev. 18 : 10). "For the time is come for judgment to begin at the house of God." (1 Pet. 4 : 17). It occurs very often in the sense of an official judicial sentence, and often also in that of a decision. If it is used at all in reference to subjective changes or crises in moral character, it is the rarest of its uses.

The New Theology adopts the arguments drawn from nature

for a future judgment. These may here be briefly repeated. The fact of accountability grows out of freedom, and accountability implies judgment. Conscience is a court in our own nature that points to a higher court and foretokens a judgment in the life to come. True, conscience might have been given as a guide to a safer life ending in the grave, but then how is it that its voice is heard in things so remote from utility, and why so much stronger in the presence of death? If there is no other judgment there is no sufficient reason for this inner tribunal, and our freedom is a delusion.

That there is a judgment after death is the universal voice of man. All nations have believed it. We have it in the ancient mythology, in the ancient philosophy, and in other forms in other ages. In every stage of culture, from the most enlightened to the most savage, there has been some form of expression of universal instinct.

There are wrongs in society that call for rectification. There is manifold injustice and there are no adequate remedies found. Our sense of justice, implanted by our Maker, asks for relief for the wronged and oppressed. Emerson in one of his essays sneers at the argument based on this fact. He thinks that all demands are fully met by the law of Compensation. But that was the opinion of a recluse and sentimental pantheist. The argument is not set aside by ridicule. John Stuart Mill, an incomparably superior philosopher, thought that the facts of the world warranted the conclusion that God failed to carry out the best part of his plan. Schopenhauer would have had no peace for his Pessimism if Compensation was such a sovereign remedy. It is not simply that many of the wicked are rich and many of the pious are poor, as Emerson says we argue, but that justice is not done. Multitudes suffer for wrongs they never committed. The guilty often escape. The martyr dies while the tyrant mocks his dying agonies. There is no tribunal this side of the grave that rectifies these wrongs. Natural laws fail to carry the balance even.

These arguments prove only a judgment—not a general judgment in the last day. But there are demands for a judgment that a private, personal judgment does not satisfy.

There are wrongs in the world that call for public correction. Public offenses may not be removed by private satisfactions. Assuming a personal God, speculation has so little to object to the Christian conception of a general judgment that if it were not taught in the Scriptures it must supply the lack. And from this view we may rise to the higher one: that it is not enough that the character of the individual be fixed, or that he should know that it is fixed, but it is due his fellow-men, with whom he stands in mysterious solidarity, and to the universe that they should know that it is fixed. A general judgment would serve well this purpose.

The New Theology claims to be the old, the Greek theology revived. The modern view of the final judgment is wholly new. The early fathers were not agreed as to many points in regard to the last times, but there was but one faith in respect to the judgment. They all* thought that it was to be an "event," a catastrophe at the close of the world's history. "All were at one—men of the Johannic school, as Polycarp and Papias—of the Pauline, as Ignatius and Clement of Rome—of the Petrine, as Barnabas—of that of James, as Hermas and Hegesippus—all were at one as to the fact that a return of Christ was to be expected when he should raise the dead and hold the judgment,

*Prof. A. V. G. Allen would make Clement of Alexandria an exception. "The opinion once so generally held, especially among Jewish Christians, and still prevailing among the Christians in the West in Clement's own time, that Christ was soon to return to make a second personal coming in the flesh, in order to introduce a millennium for the faithful and to take vengeance upon his adversaries, is to his mind irrational, for it contradicts his supreme conviction that the essential spiritual Christ is here already in the fulness of his exalted might and has already begun to witness his triumph at the right hand of the Father. The judgment of the world is not viewed as a fixed event in the distant future, but as now forming an integral part of the process by which the human race is educated under its divine Instructor." (Continuity of Christian Thought, p. 66). Prof. A. admits that Clement expressed himself sparingly on all subjects pertaining to the last times, and it is at least probable that he saw in the Stromata nothing more than the reflexion of his own sentiments. Clement was not a systematic thinker, and there are many heterogeneous ideas thrown together in his writings. His Stromata is particularly a chaotic mass of truth and error drawn from Greek philosophers and Christian sects.

and when the Church should be perfected by the separation from the evil." (Dorner's Doctrine of the Person of Christ, D. 1, Vol. 1, p. 143). Neander says of the first three centuries: "They could conceive of it no otherwise than this, the struggle between Church and State would endure till triumph was brought about from without by the return of Christ to judgment." (Church History, Vol. 1, p. 650). Basil the Great, Gregory Nazianzen and Origen, as well as Tertullian, Cyprian and Augustine believed in a sudden, visible return of Christ to judgment. The same faith was transmitted through the succeeding centuries to the Reformation. Peter DeOliva in the thirteenth century taught that there are great epochs in the evolution of the kingdom of God, but we must distinguish a threefold manifestation of Christ in the history of the world—the first and last visible. Militz in the fourteenth century thought the angels who gather the tares are the faithful preachers of the Gospel, were men, but in other respects he held the common doctrine.

The Evangelical Church accepted the ancient faith. The Augsburg Confession says: "The same Christ shall openly come again to judge the quick and the dead." More fully in another article: "Also they teach that in the consummation of the world Christ shall appear to judge and shall raise up all the dead." The Belgic Confession (1561) says, "We believe according to the Word of God that when the time appointed by the Lord is come and the number of the elect complete our Lord Jesus Christ will come from heaven corporally and visibly, as he ascended, with great glory and majesty to declare himself Judge of the quick and the dead, burning this old world with fire and flame to cleanse it." In slightly changed language there is perfect unanimity among all the creeds where the doctrine is mentioned at all.

It is only in very recent times that we hear of any other opinion. The Rationalists first desired only a general, indefinite statement. Afterwards came the idea of Schelling: that "the history of the world is the world's judgment." Then there is a late view, analogous to Schelling's, that the last judgment is now in process. Closely akin to this is the doctrine of some premillinarians. Dr. Seiss in his Last Times says, "The judgment of

God is the administration of God" (p. 141). Again in his Ten Virgins, "And so the judgeship of Christ is not to be separated from the reign of Christ or his sovereign ministrations as King of kings and Lord of lords" (p. 162). He pronounces the old view—"of hearing and determining each one's individual case at some grand assize in which all men shall simultaneously appear before Christ to receive their dooms"—"a meagre and most inadequate view of the matter." But at the time of the publication of the first edition of his Last Times (the later is not at hand) he knew of no orthodox writer who regarded it as a mere process, for the authors quoted do not teach that it is a mere process but only that the judgment is held during the time of the millennium. But the premillenarian view differs in several essential particulars from the modern doctrine. The New Theology so far as it departs from the old orthodox doctrine cuts itself loose from the whole current of the Church's faith and allies itself with rationalists.

This perfect unanimity of faith on this subject in all ages and amid such diversity in other doctrines is itself a strong argument for its truth. If Christ taught a mere process, a crisis in individual character, a mere development in individual history, it is very strange that the disciples and all the ages since should have so thoroughly misunderstood him. If he promised only a coming in history but no personal, visible return in splendor and glory, it is very remarkable that all ages of the Church should have been so blinded by Jewish sensuousness as to continue to look for him.

This argument is so strong that a number of attempts have been made to explain the fact away. Some suppose that the disciples misunderstood the words of Christ. Weiffanbach attempts to reduce the prophecies of Christ concerning his return to a promise to reappear after his resurrection. Some think that Christ himself was mistaken. Others, despite the very wide difference between the Jewish hopes of Messiah and the Christian idea of the second advent, would explain it by mere Jewish crassness. J. Freeman Clarke proposes a solution in mere "rhetoric," but finding that not quite sufficient was forced to resort to the supposition that "Paul's views on this subject gradually

changed under the influence of a growing spiritual insight." (Orthodoxy, Truths and Errors, p. 348). Such are the difficulties men have found when trying to cut loose from the old doctrine of the last day.

The faith that has stood for ages will stand unless proven false. The *onus probandi* falls on the new. Those who have been schooled in the theology of the Scriptures must be convinced by proofs drawn from the Scriptures before they will give up the old doctrines. A thorough discussion of the Biblical statements would require an entire article but we may consider the main points.

The Scriptures teach that the final judgment is a definite event at the close of the world. "Inasmuch as he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness." (Acts 17 : 13). "Wherefore judge nothing before the time until the Lord come, who will both bring to light the hidden things of darkness and make manifest the counsels of the hearts, and then shall every man have praise of God." (1 Cor. 4 : 5). "The word that I spoke shall judge him at the last day." (John 12 : 48). "I say unto you that it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for you." (Matt. 11 : 24). "So shall it be at the end of the world; the angels shall come forth and sever the wicked from among the righteous and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." (Matt. 13 : 49, 50). "Before him shall be gathered all the nations." (Matt. 25 : 31). "The day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night." (1 Thess. 5 : 2). Day here, as often in the Scriptures, means a period, but a period still to come; for in it "he will judge the world," embracing "the nations," of which nations Sodom will be one. It will be at the end of the world, and will come as a thief in the night. These passages and others cannot by any natural interpretation be applied to a mere process.

This general judgment will be immediately preceded by the general resurrection and the visible advent of Christ. This visible advent is a catastrophe and by modern thought is denied. A personal coming is conceded, but "it is spiritual to the soul." "Christ comes to us in the form of new truth which will correct

our errors and enlarge our hearts." This view confounds the two kinds of coming. Christ speaks of comings that were to take place during that age. "Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel till the Son of man be come." (Matt. 10 : 23). "There be some standing here which shall in no wise taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." (Matt. 16 : 28). "Repent or else I will come to thee quickly." (Rev. 2 : 16). "The Lord is at hand." (Phil. 4 : 5). These comings do not by any means exhaust the scriptural idea. If at one place he says "The kingdom of heaven does not come with observation," he does not exclude another stage of that kingdom which will come with grand displays of power. If he speaks repeatedly of coming to individuals and to ages, he does not thereby cut off the idea of an open, manifest return. "This Jesus which was received up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye beheld him going into heaven." There is no symbolism here; it is the plainest and most direct form of statement. "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout with the voice of the arch angel and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first." Though Clarke says that "Paul outgrew this literalism and in his later epistles speaks of sitting already with Christ in 'heavenly places'" (Orthodoxy, p. 327) yet it is worth while to see what that great apostle taught. "Christ the first fruits, then they that are Christ's at his coming. Then cometh the end." (1 Cor. 15 : 23, 24). In Acts we are told "the heavens must receive him until the times of restoration of all things" (Acts 3 : 20), and Paul tells us that "our conversation is in heaven, from whence we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ." (Phil. 3 : 20). John teaches the same truth. "Behold he cometh with the clouds, and every eye shall see him and they which pierced him, and all the tribes of the earth shall mourn over him, even so." (Rev. 1 : 7). In Hebrews we are told that he "shall appear apart from sin to them that wait for him." (Heb. 9 : 28). Whatever difficulty there may be in explaining Matt. 16 : 27, 28 and the parallels in Mark and Luke our Lord in his discourses teaches the same thing that Paul does in his earlier epistles. This is found in many of his

parables—as that of the nobleman, of the virgins, of the talents, of the unjust judge, and others. He spoke of raising the dead at the last day (John 6 : 40, 54). He tells us that "all the tribes of the earth shall mourn and they shall see the Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory" (Matt. 24 : 30), and that when he "shall come in his glory and all the angels with him them shall he sit on the throne of his glory" (Matt. 25 : 31), and that "as the lightning, when it lighteneth out of the one part under the heaven shineth unto the other part under heaven, so shall the Son of man be in his day." (Luke 17 : 24).

The modern theology attempts to destroy the force of the language of our Lord in three ways. First, it attempts to explain all his eschatological prophecies by that one saying, "The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels, and then shall he render unto every man according to his deeds. Verily I say unto you there be some that stand here which shall in no wise taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." This passage is acknowledged by all to have difficulties—for the new as well as the old doctrine. But we are asked to reverse the rule and explain the plainer teachings elsewhere by this the more difficult. The new applies it arbitrarily to the destruction of Jerusalem. It may and most probably has another meaning. Second, The new fails to see anything in the long discourses in Matthew but a prophecy of the taking of Jerusalem, ignoring the fact that our Lord was answering two questions—one concerning the ruin of the temple and the other the end of the world. It forgets also the nature of prophecy: combining in the same view two or more events, the one being a type of the other. The fall of Jerusalem is made a type of the end of the world, and thus in foretelling the one he prophesies of the other. With this key the last part of the discourse is seen to refer clearly to the final judgment. Third, It finds symbolism in these discourses and thus assigns all that is contrary to its theory to figure of speech. Dorner says, "For as Schleiermacher rightly saw, Christ's second coming forms the real center of the entire Christian eschatology, and we shall recognize its dogmatic importance in reference to

the person, office and kingdom of Christ, however important it may be to take into account the figurative phraseology in the exposition of this fundamental thought." There is figurative language but "it is the garb of the glorious thought of God." The same principle applied to the other discourses of Christ would leave us very little that would be worth the saving. Van Oosterzee in reference to the symbolism in the teachings of the New Testament in regard to the last things says, "All the Apostolic exhortations and consolations are so closely connected with the prospect of a personal return of the Lord that whoever contradicts this last thereby takes away the roof and cornice from the structure of the Apostolic theology."

The two theologies are agreed that Christ is judge. The testimony of the Scriptures is unmistakable. "For we must all be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ" (2 Cor. 5 : 10). "This is he which is ordained of God to be the Judge of the quick and dead." (Acts 10 : 42). "For neither doth the Father judge any man but he hath given all judgment unto the Son." (John 5 : 22). "He will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained." (Acts 17 : 31).

But they disagree as to the reasons of the judgeship and the manner in which he discharges its function. The new finds the reasons in his relation of the truth. He is regarded as so connected with the truth as to determine in connexion with it personal character. He judges every man because every man either in this life or the next must form and fix forever his character under the motive of the personal work of Christ. But the old theology finds that reason in the relation in which he stands to the world as ruler. He must reign until every knee shall bow and every tongue shall confess—until all things are brought into subjection. The general review of his work and the exhibition of its perfect righteousness is the last act of his administration.

Even if it were true that all men are to be offered salvation, the reason assigned by the new would not be sufficient to account for the appointment. He is to judge angels who have not been redeemed. "Now shall the prince of this world be cast out." "Of judgment because the prince of this world hath been judged." (John 12 : 31 ; 16 : 11). "For if God spared

not angels when they sinned but cast them down to hell to be reserved unto judgment." (2 Pet. 2 : 4). "And the angels which kept not their own principality but left their proper habitation he hath kept in everlasting bonds under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." (Jude 6). "And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone." (Rev. 20 : 10). Not only this judgment of the fallen angels remains unexplained by the new theology but also the work which Christ does in the final judgment. He is said to come, not to fix character, but to reward it. We stand before his judgment seat "that every one may receive the things done in the body according to that he hath done whether it be good or bad." (2 Cor. 5 : 10). "Who will render to every man according to his works." (Rom. 2 : 6). In the description given in Matthew 25 he pronounces judgment upon character formed at other times and places.

The final judgment is not to reveal character to the individual himself but to manifest it to the world. He will judge the dead as well as the quick (Acts 10 : 42; 2 Tim. 4 : 1; 1 Pet. 4 : 5). He will judge the dead for deeds done in the body. The character formed by these deeds had long before not only been determined but revealed to each individual. What rational purpose in calling them up again to show them what they already know? It must, then, be to show that character to others.

The New Theology must explain away a large class of passages, or leave two classes unreconciled, which present no difficulty to the old doctrine The Bible on the one hand makes personal faith the condition of salvation. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, but he that believeth not the Son shall not see life but the wrath of God abideth on him." "For by grace have ye been saved through faith." "Being justified by faith we have peace with God." "Whosoever believeth on him should not perish but have eternal life." Even if we rule out the language in Mark the doctrine is that of Paul and all the apostles: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved but he that believeth not shall be condemned." But the Bible teaches on the other hand just as clearly that we shall be judged in the last day by our works.

Further, the Bible teaches on the one hand that many at least

enter at death upon their eternal reward. "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." "To be absent from the body and to be at home with the Lord." "If the earthly house of our tabernacle be dissolved we have a building from God, a house not made with hands eternal in the heavens." "And it came to pass that the beggar died and that he was carried away by angels to Abraham's bosom; and the rich man also died and was buried. And in Hades he lifted up his eyes being in torments." But the Bible teaches on the other hand that in the final day all nations shall be gathered before the judgment to receive rewards.

Shall we be judged at one time according to our faith and at another by our works with precisely the same end in view? Shall God decide our fate at death and then call us again to review our character to assure himself that he made no mistake? The New Theology may find a reconciliation by changing the doctrines of the atonement and justification by faith and by putting forced interpretations upon the texts concerning the judgment, but according to the old doctrines these statements are not only in natural and complete harmony with themselves but also with all the cardinal doctrines of Christianity. For naturalness and consistency the old may challenge comparison. There is no conflict in these seemingly opposite declarations of the Scriptures if God, as the old theology taught, decides our condition at first in view of our faith and then at the last reviews our lives to show the correctness of his decision. We are saved through our faith. Faith reveals itself through works. God reads hearts and knows what is in man. Creatures can know the hearts of others only as seen in character. When God decides for himself he looks immediately at the faith. When he would show others that this individual has been justly saved and that one justly condemned because of the relation of each to the terms of salvation, he must point to the evidences of faith or disbelief in the conduct. If God created the world to reveal his own character to himself there might be no need of a general judgment, but he created and administers the affairs of the world to reveal himself to intelligent creatures. If God were only a Father there would perhaps be no need of a general review, but he is King as well as Father. He maintains his au-

thority by enforcing his laws. He wants loyal subjects and he seeks, therefore, to show them that he is no respecter of persons but is just and equal in his administration. To secure this end, just before the final consummation he reviews his government in its details and puts forever beyond question the fact that it was established in righteousness.

ARTICLE V.

THE REQUISITES OF A GOOD LUTHERAN CATECHISM.

By Rev. H. Ziegler, D. D., Des Moines, Iowa.

This is a subject of the highest importance in our Church, and yet, to my knowledge, it has never received a careful and thorough discussion. The following article proposes to undertake this task.

The *first* requisite is— *Such a work must make the text of Luther's Catechism the basis of its outline and entire development.*

Without this, it would be no Lutheran catechism. Besides, nothing better, in subject-matter, can be produced to attain the great ends of catechetical instruction—conviction of sin, repentance towards God, faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and subsequent growth in the divine life.

The *second* requisite is— *The catechism as a whole must possess comprehensiveness, brevity and simplicity.*

It must be sufficiently comprehensive, in its outline, to embrace everything that is vitally essential to the production and growth of a healthy and earnest Christian life and experience; in its details, it must be sufficiently brief to allow of development by the catechist, and to be easily memorized and retained, and, in its language, also sufficiently simple, to be readily understood by the catechumen.

The *third* requsite is— *The English text of the catechism must be free from faulty translations.*

In Luther's explanation of the second article of the Apostles' Creed, we have introduced and perpetuated a faulty translation in our General Synod's English Catechism. It is in these words :

"Who hath redeemed, purchased and delivered me." This is taken from the German text, and reads: "Der mich verlornen, verdammten Menschen erlöset hat, erworben und gewonnen von allen Sünden. (Who hath redeemed me a lost, condemned person, purchased and delivered me from sin, etc.)

Our catechism makes the three terms—redeemed, purchased and delivered—coördinate, together expresssing the work of Christ for us. The erroneousness of such a rendering is seen, *first*, in the impossibility of making each of these three terms express a distinct part of our redemption. It is seen *secondly*, in the collocation of the words in the German of Luther's Catechism: "Der * * erlöset hat, erworben und gewon." Were the three terms intended to be coördinate, they should stand: Erlöset, erworben, und gewonnen hat; but as the auxiliary, "hat," stands after the first of these terms, it must be generic, and the two which follow are specific or explanatory. This is still more evident when we consult the Larger Catechism, in which Luther makes his meaning very clear. "To become our Lord," he says, signifies, "that he hath redeemed me from sin," etc. Further on, he explains this to include: "Who hath torn us from the jaws of hell, regained us, made us free, and brought us again into the protection and grace of the Father, and has taken us, as his own property, under his own protection and care, that he might govern us," etc. He used the German terms—"aus der Höllen Rachen gerissen, gewonnen, frei gemacht, und wiederbracht in des Fater's Huld und Gnade." Again, in summing up the meaning of this second article of the Creed, and after once more stating what our Redeemer has done, namely, "brought us from satan to God, from death to life, from sin to righteousness, and preserving us in the same," he proceeds to tell us, that the different parts of this article as they follow each other, are only intended to explain and express this redemption, how and by what means it was accomplished, namely, what it became him to do, and what he actually did and ventured ("gemacht hat,") that he might regain us (gewönna), and bring us under his dominion.*

*Müller's Symb. Books, vol. I., pp. 453, 454. Ed. 1848.

All these terms—tearing us out of the jaws of hell, regaining us, freeing us, bringing us into the protection of the Father and under his own dominion—are Luther's own explanation of the term, *redeem;* and this explanation he gives us in his Smaller Catechism, in the terms, *erworben* und *gewonnen* (purchased and delivered); and also in the closing words: "In order that I might be his, live under him in his kingdom, and serve him in everlasting righteousness, innocence and happiness."

The two Latin terms, "*redemit et liberavit,*" are coördinates, the former expressing the atoning work of Christ, and the latter the end accomplished by it; and they are not, as in the German, preceded by a generic term including the sense of both of them. The correct translation, then, is—"Who hath redeemed me a lost, condemned person, purchased and delivered me."

This correction of making redeemed, generic, and purchased and delivered, specific or explanatory, is recognized in the following English translations of the catechism by the Synod of Pennsylvania, Dr. Conrad and Dr. Pantoppidan. But those of the Pennsylvania Synod and Dr. Conrad both afterwards seem to make these same terms coördinate. In that of the Synod of Pennsylvania, the 218th question reads: "Are you still such a *lost* and *condemned* creature?"

"No! For my Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, has redeemed and delivered me from all sins, from death, and from the power of the devil."

Whilst Luther's arrangement of these terms are given in the translation of the article from which they are taken, and also in the 216th question, here we have them placed together and made coördinate; and then in questions 219, 220 and 221, we have the terms, "purchased," and "delivered," covering the entire ground of the three terms in question 218. I must confess to confusion in the use of these terms.

In that of Dr. Conrad, the 214th question reads: "What has Christ done for us by his sufferings and death?" "He has redeemed and delivered us from all sin, from death, and from the power of the devil."

Here the Dr. seems to have no use for the term, "secured," as given in the translation of the article in the front part of his

catechism. Besides, we must take the two terms, "redeemed and delivered," which he retains in his 214th question, as coördinate. Then in the 215th question, namely: "What is meant by Christ's redeeming us from sin?" Ans.: "That he, by his sufferings, made an atonement for our sins and delivered us from their guilt and power"—in this question he makes the term, "redeem," cover the ground of purchase and deliver. Again, in question 216th, he has no use for either of the terms, redeem, secure, or deliver, for in the question he uses "preserved," and in the answer "ransomed," namely: "How has he preserved us from death?" Ans.: "He has ransomed us from the fear of natural and the pains of eternal death, and will raise us up at the last day." If we are to understand the terms, "redeemed and delivered," in question 214th, as coördinate, then questions 215, 216 and 217, should read: 215. What is meant by Christ's redeeming and delivering us from sin? 216. How has he redeemed and delivered us from death? 217. What is meant by Christ's redeeming and delivering us from the power of the devil? If, on the contrary, "redeem" is used generically, and "delivered," specifically or explanatory, then the term "redeem" should alone appear in the three questions above. Again, I must confess to the same confusion to the Dr's use of these terms, as in the previous case.

Allow me to suggest that all this confusion arises from not considering "redeem as generic, and "purchased and delivered," explanatory. Thus understood and treated, no confusion can possibly arise.

Dr. Pontoppidan strictly follows this plan. In putting his questions (from 212 to 227), he uses no other term but the generic, "redeem."

In the third article of the Creed, the General Synod's Catechism has another faulty translation, in the words "*not merely.*"

This implies that our reason and other natural powers can do something towards believing in, and coming to, Jesus Christ our Lord. This is a grave doctrinal error, and contrary to all Lutheran theology. That it ever crept into our English translation, and that it has been so long retained, does no honor either to

our learning or our sound doctrine. We will carefully examine the original. The German reads: "Ich glaube, dasz Ich nicht aus eigener Vernunft noch Kraft an Jesum Christum, meinen Herrn, glauben oder zu ihm kommen kann;" * * The Latin is, if possible, still stronger, "Credo me propriis rationis meae viribus Jesu Christo, Domino meo, fidere, aut ad eum accedere et pervenire nullo modo posse;" * * The German, as thus seen, simply denies any ability to our human reason and other natural powers, in believing in, and coming to, Christ, without the divine call, etc., whilst the Latin declares that this is *by no means* possible to the strength of our own reason.

In the Larger Catechism, Luther says: "For neither you nor I could ever know anything of Christ, neither could we believe in him nor find the way to him, were it not offered to us and placed as a gift in our bosom by the Holy Spirit through the Gospel." Again, "For although the whole world has been earnestly searching to know what God is, and what he purposes and actually does, yet has it never been able to attain to a knowledge of any one of these truths."*

Again, in the same article, our catechism makes the "Communion of Saints," a separate article from "The Holy Catholic Church," by the punctuation both in the English and German texts.

In his Larger Catechism, Luther explains it thus: "The Creed calls the Holy Christian Church communio sanctorum, a communion of saints, for both parts are placed together to express the same thing. But formerly the one part was wanting, and it is badly and without sense (unverständlich) rendered in German by communion of saints." Again, "Also this word communio, which has been added, should not be rendered communion, but congregation." And once more, "But to use pure German, it should be called, a congregation of saints, that is, a congregation in which there are purely holy persons, or still plainer, a holy congregation."†

Dr. Morris' catechism retains both these faulty translations. (See p. 72, question 3, and pp. 78 and 79, questions 1 to 6).

*Müller's Symb. Books, vol. I., pp. 455 and 460. Ed. 1848.

†Müller as above, p. 456 and 457.

Dr. Conrad's translation corrects the first of these mistakes, ("not merely") but retains the latter ("the communion of saints") in his explanations, (pp. 11 and 70 and 71).

Whilst nothing unscriptural is taught in these catechisms in the explanation of this article of the communion of saints, there is certainly no good reason why we should depart from the sense in which Luther and our Church generally has employed it. The communion of saints with God and with one another, can still be taught in connection with the one universal Church.

Also in Luther's explanation of the introduction of the Lord's Prayer, our General Synod's catechism is lame: First, in the words, "Even as *beloved* children entreat a *kind and affectionate* parent."

These words—"beloved," and "kind and affectionate," locate all the affection and disposition expressed by them, exclusively in the parent—none whatever in the child. It is a child "beloved" by the Father, and it is a "kind and affectionate" father towards his child. Now, whilst this is all true of God as our Father, it is not found in Luther's catechism, In the Latin we have no qualifying terms—it is simply, "liberos," and "parentibus suis." The German has it—"die lieben Kinder," and "ihren lieben Vater."

Now, whatever sense we may give to "lieben," it describes equally the affection of the child towards the parent, as it does that of the parent towards his child. A correct literal rendering, therefore, would be: Even as dear children entreat a dear father —that is, as the parent's most tender affections go out towards, and center and linger around, his child, so in like manner do the same affections on the part of the child, manifest themselves towards its parent—the feelings and attachments are mutual. On the part of God, it is expressed thus: "As a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him." "But when he was yet a great way off, his father saw him, and had compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck and kissed him." * * "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son." * * On the part of the child it is: "Whom have I in heaven but thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire besides thee; * * but God is * * my portion forever." "As

the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God. My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God; when shall I come and appear before God?"

These terms, "beloved" and "affectionate," ascribing all the affection to the Father and none to the child, are found, as far as I have examined, in all our English catechisms.

Our General Synod's catechism is faulty, again, in rendering Luther's explanation of this introduction, in the term employed to connect the last clause—"to call upon him with all cheerfulness," etc.,—with the first clause—"That God would affectionately invite us," etc. This connecting word is "*and;*" and the sense of our rendering is, "That God would hereby affectionately invite us," *first*, "to believe, and to be assured," * * and *secondly*, "to call upon him with all cheerfulness." * *

Luther's connecting term is, "*auf dasz*," in order that. According to this, "God would affectionately invite us to believe that he is truly our Father, and that we are his children indeed, *in order that* we may call upon him with all cheerfulness," etc. It makes our calling upon God as dear children call upon a dear father, dependent upon the antecedent attainment and the present possession, of an assured belief that God is our right Father, and we his right children.

This involves an important doctrinal statement—nothing less than that God by his prevenient grace works faith in us through the gospel call, and thus, by the light, comfort, and renewal which this faith brings us, enables us to call him "Abba Father."

I have never seen this distinctly brought out in any of our catechisms. Dr. Conrad's answer to his 279th question, "What is meant by this?" (the introduction of the Lord's Prayer). Ans. "It means that we are the children of God, and that we may cheerfully present our prayers to him as to an affectionate father, with all confidence that he will hear them"—is all true in itself, but it fails to bring out what Luther intended. And yet, how important is it that our catechumens should clearly understand this before proceeding to the petitions themselves—it is the importance of having the right faith in God as our heavenly Father, in order that we may draw near to him in prayer, in the

only right way—in cheerful, filial confidence that he will hear us.

It may be admitted before proceeding, that the order of connexion between God's inviting us "to believe that he is truly * * and "to call upon him with all, * *," may be so handled as to maintain that this very connexion teaches that our faith is the preparation for our calling upon God, as just indicated; but grammatically, it is not in the translation.

To bring out the spirit and beauty of Luther's explanation of this introduction, in its full force and comprehensiveness, I would suggest something like the following series of questions:

1. What relation between us and God, does this explanation of Luther refer to?
2. Do we heartily believe this, by nature?
3. How does God work this faith in us, according to Luther's explanation?
4. To what end does God work this faith in us? "In order that we may * * "
5. How are these several terms to be understood?
6. Can we not pray in this cheerful, childlike, and confiding spirit, without this faith?
7. Give me the reason why we cannot.
8. Have you this faith?

I would call attention also to the words, "truly our Father," and "his children indeed." The terms for "truly" and "indeed," are, in Latin, "verus," and in German, "recht." "Scheller's Lateinisch-Deutsches Hand-lexicon," and "Heyse's Handwörterbuch der deutschen Sprache," define these words, thus: *Verus*, by wahr, echt, by viewing a thing in its right light, as, a true father in opposition to a step-father, as a true faith, etc.; and *recht*, by verus, legitimus, echt, and by anything bearing the marks of its own kind or genus, as, a true friend, the true God, the true faith.

These two terms, *verus* and *recht*, are then used synonymously; and they view the relation between parent and child from two standpoints, the legal and moral. A true or right father or child is so, *legitimately* before the law, and *morally*, by possessing and exercising the affections and dispositions, and performing the

duties, of such a father or child. Thus, God is our true or right Father, *legitimately*, by creation and adoption, and *morally*, becauses he possesses and exercises towards us all the duties, of such a Father, in redeeming us, and in his providential dealings and gracious care exercised over us from day to day. Similarly, we are God's true and right children, *legitimately*, also by creation and adoption, and *morally*, because we also possess and exercise towards God the affections and dispositions, and perform the duties, implied in this relation.

I would, then, render Luther's explanation of this introduction, thus: "God desires hereby most affectionately to invite, draw, and influence* us to believe that he is our true and right Father, and we his true and right children, in order that we may call upon him with cheerfulness and in full confidence, as dear children entreat a dear father.

The *fourth* requisite is—*The doctrinal statements must be in harmony with the word of God and our recognized confessions.*

Under the previous test, I called attention to the synergistic error, that our reason and other natural powers have some ability to believe in, and come to, Jesus Christ our Lord. Also, to the doctrine of prevenient grace, in preparing us, by the invitations of the gospel and by the faith wrought thereby, to pray with cheerfulness and confidence to our Father in heaven.

Now, whilst the standards of our Church and her teaching have always been correct on these doctrines, it is, nevertheless, a matter of vital importance, that, in a book for the indoctrination of our youth, all doctrinal statements should be so precise and clear, that there could not possibly be left any doubt or confusion on the mind of any one. I need not insist on this—it is sufficient to mention it.

The *fifth* requisite is—*The catechism ought to set forth with great prominence and clearness our ruin and helplessness as sinners, the plan of salvation through the atonement of Jesus Christ, and our regeneration and sanctification by the Holy Spirit, through the means of grace.*

The defects here are, when the catechumen, after having

*I can find no one English word to express the German, "locken." [Why not "persuade"?—Ed.]

passed through a course of instruction, has confused or erroneous views on any of the following points:

1. If he does not perceive that, on account of his personal sinfulness and helplessness, his only hope of salvation is in our Saviour Jesus Christ.

2. If he does not clearly understand the divine conditions of salvation.

3. When he is left in doubt on any one of the following points:

(a). Have I complied with the conditions of salvation?

(b). Have I been born again?

(c). Am I justified by faith in our Lord Jesus Christ?

(d). Am I converted?

(e). Am I a child and heir of God by adoption into his family?

Our *sixth* requisite is—*The subject-matter of the catechism ought to be arranged in a natural order, that is, in the order in which it must be personally appropriated to produce a healthy and vigorous Christian life and experience.*

We will now call attention to several plans for the attainment of this end.

First: To use Luther's catechism in the order of its five parts, without any explanatory questions and answers, leaving it entirely with the catechist to propound his own questions, and bring out fully and pointedly the order already indicated.

Second: To use Luther's catechism, as in the first plan, without any accompanying explanations, and then afterwards, by supplements, to explain fully the doctrines and duties which it inculcates, in systematic connexion, especially with the view of making clear and prominent the plan of salvation.

Third: Also to follow the order of Luther's Catechism, but accompanied with explanatory questions and answers, and bringing out, in connexion with these explanations the natural order we are seeking.

Fourth: Again to use the five parts of Luther's catechism, but to rearrange and combine their subject-matter so as to give us our natural order.

We will examine these several plans as to their respective merits.

THE FIRST PLAN.

Adopting this plan, the catechist ought to follow, accurately, the order of Luther's catechism, giving, *first*, his main questions and answers; *secondly*, his questions and answers explanatory of each main question; and then should follow, *thirdly*, a sufficient number of additional questions to embrace every distinct idea contained in Luther's explanatory answers, and following, as far as possible, their order of arrangement. This was evidently Luther's plan. (See the introduction to his Smaller Catechism, 2nd and 3rd divs.)

The advantages of this plan are:

1. That we preserve the text of Luther's catechism intact.

2. That we have in Luther's answers a skeleton of the entire development based upon them.

3. That this skeleton would be a great advantage to the catechist, enabling him to make it the basis of his examinations of his catechumens on the questions based upon it; and also, to train them so that they can themselves expand a brief outline into a full development.

4. This would also enable the catechumen always to recall the substance of the explanations as given in the development of each topic, by merely remembering and developing the skeleton. He can, if he has been trained as above indicated, form for himself, from the terms of this skeleton, all the prominent questions based upon it by his instructor. This would, therefore, be a great aid both to memory and personal edification.

But this plan has also its disadvantages. (a) Whilst the order of Luther's arrangement is natural in its design and the means to attain it, it is unnatural in this, that the first part (the ten commandments) already implies a knowledge of God as necessary to our accepting, explaining, enforcing and obeying, his commandments. (b) Again, this plan leaves too much to the catechist in regard to the details of doctrine, and in making clear and prominent the plan of salvation. It necessarily presupposes that each pastor possesses not only a good faculty for analysis and generalization, but also, a clear insight into the prac-

tical relations of religious truth; both of which are necessary to success in using our first plan. This can not be expected—consequently, on this plan, many of our pastors would fail in attaining fully the great ends of catechetical instruction, either from a want of the necessary catechetical tact, or for time to make the requisite preparation.

These defects have been constantly recognized by our Church both in the old world and the new, by the many efforts that have been made to remedy them.

THE SECOND PLAN.

This plan was early adopted by the Lutheran Church in this country The Synod of Pennsylvania, in its German edition of 1841, adds as a supplement to Luther's catechism, Parts II. III. IV. and V., including fourteen sub-heads. The first of these additions (Part II.) with its four sub-divisions, is devoted exclusively to the setting forth and explaining of the order of salvation.* Our General Synod also, in the various issues of its catechism, has uniformly supplemented Luther's five parts, with the last two sub-divisions just referred to, designating them Parts VI. and VII., and for the same purpose of explaining the plan of salvation.

This second plan has much to recommend it. It retains the advantages of the first plan, whilst it removes its defects, or, at least, makes such removal possible. How far our General Synod's catechism has succeeded in attaining its end by its supplementary Part VI., will be seen hereafter.

THE THIRD PLAN.

Namely, To follow the order of Luther's catechism, accompanying it with explanatory questions and answers, and bringing out, in connection with these explanations, the natural order we are seeking.

This plan has never been attempted by our General Synod; private ministers have not been wanting, however, to try their hand at it.

---

*See pp. 44–76.

As already stated, this plan must necessarily fail to give us a good natural order of salvation—indeed, it has always failed on this point whenever adopted.

THE FOURTH PLAN.

This plan as above stated, is to re-arrange and combine the five parts of Luther's catechism in the order in which divine truth must be personally appropriated so as to produce a healthy and vigorous Christian life and experience.

This re-arranged order would be as follows—

1. *The first article of the Creed:* Including the existence, nature and attributes of God, creation, preservation, government, and our duty towards God growing out of these doctrines, as shown in Luther's explanation of this article. Therefore,—

2. *The Ten Commandments:* To point out—our duty, our actual sinfulness, our natural depravity and our lost and condemned condition.* Therefore,—

3. *The second article of the Creed:* To show how our return to God has been rendered possible—or, The state of grace. Here we would have the origin of grace with God the Father, the purchase of grace by God the Son, embracing his names, states, natures and offices, his work of redemption—how? what? for whom?—the end of redemption—"to be Christ's, to live under him in his kingdom, and serve him in everlasting righteousness, innocence and happiness"—The assurance that Christ will bestow upon believers these ends of redemption—Our inability without divine aid to come into this state of grace, and secure the blessings of our purchased salvation. Therefore,—

4. *The third article of the Creed:* To teach us how God affords us the requisite assistance to enable us to secure our salvation, or, *The application of grace.* Here we would have—Wherein our inability consists; How the divine aid is afforded and this inability is removed, namely, By the Holy Spirit operating through the gospel and the Church, as means, and through which he calls, enlightens, and sanctifies us, and gathers us into the holy Christian Church; The completeness of our salvation as purchased by Christ, and now brought within our reach by

*This includes, the state of sin.

the Holy Spirit. This last point would include—Forgiveness of sin, "daily and richly;" adoption, sanctification, preservation in union with Christ—also, our resurrection, and everlasting life for soul and body.

5. *The reception of grace:* or, The conditions on which we can secure the salvation purchased by Christ, and offered unto us by the Holy Spirit—namely, repentance, faith, and the use of the means of grace, including The Lord's Prayer, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper.

I would add a brief recapitulation of the plan of salvation, for the express purpose of making deep and lasting impressions on the minds of the catechumens, and especially, of leading each one to accept and appropriate the truth savingly for himself. This recapitulation would be about the following:

A conscious sense of our ruined condition as sinners—an earnest longing to secure salvation—a clear conception of the way in which the work of Christ renders it just and possible for God to save sinners, namely, leading us to return to God by repentance and faith, justifying us by faith in Christ, enabling us to appropriate the fulness of Christ's salvation, as implied in his threefold office of prophet, priest, and king, or "Christ made of God unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption," and sanctifying and preserving us in the true faith, by the Holy Spirit and the use of the means of grace.

I would add again, an explanation and application of the main points of Christian experience, to which reference has already been made, so as to remove all remaining confusion and doubts on these vital doctrines. These points are—Have I been born again? Am I justified by faith in our Lord Jesus Christ? Am I converted? Am I walking after the Spirit in newness of life? Am I a child and heir of God by adoption into his family?

And I would add yet once more, Part VII. of our General Synod's catechism, slightly modified, to be used—As a brief outline of Christian doctrines—For the examination and drill of the catechumens—And as an aid to memory.

Our *seventh* requisite is—*The catechism should be suggestive*, affording the catechist the opportunity, by questions of his own, for development, elucidation, and enforcement, and thus also, of

leading his catechumens to think and reason on religious truth and to apply it practically to their own condition and wants.

A main deficiency here is, when the catechism takes up every main idea suggested by an answer, and develops it anew not only by a new question but also by a new answer. Some one has said of a certain catechism, "It adds also to its worth, that, unlike some others, its explanations do not need explaining." If this is intended to mean that the language is so plain that it needs no explanation on the part of the teacher to enable the scholar to see the author's meaning, then we assent; but if it designs to say, that it is an excellence in a catechism to have its answers so full and clear that they will require neither elucidation nor development, then we decidedly protest. Such a catechism never has been written and never will be. Besides, if this were possible, it is not at all desirable. There must be room for the catechist to pursue the Socratic method of instruction, for the purposes already indicated.

The *eighth* requisite is—*The questions and answers must be couched in language which expresses fully and accurately the idea intended, and the dicta probantia must be a legitimate proof of the answer.*

Here the following defects may show themselves:

1. When the question suggests an answer different from the one intended and given. 2. When the answer is not legitimate to the question, namely, when it is not based exclusively on the terms of the question, or when some form in the question is used in a different sense from that in which it is used in the answer. 3. When the answer contains more or less than the question requires. 4. When the *dicta probantia* are not legitimate, namely, when they do not fairly prove the answer, or when they prove something different from it.

I will give a few examples. In questions 323, 325 and 326, of Dr. Pontoppidan's catechism (Eng. trans.) he puts the questions with *How?* but answers the questions, *In what sense?* In our General Synod's catechism, Part VI., question 72, reads: "Where did Christ remain after his resurrection?" But it answers an entirely different question, namely, Where did Christ go at the end of forty days after his resurrection? See also ques-

tion 324 and 325 in Dr. Conrad's catechism. The 324th—"What ordinances of a similar character did God institute in the Jewish dispensation? Ans. "Circumcision and the Passover." The 325th—"What is the difference between the ordinances of the Old, and the sacraments of the New Testament?" Ans. "The former were the mere 'figures' and 'shadows of good things to come,' while the latter are the seals and mediums of the blessings of the gospel themselves."

Take the ordinances of the old Testament as given in question 325, to refer merely to circumcision and the Passover, then these institutions were *mere figures and shadows* * * and neither seals nor mediums of gospel blessings. But understand these same ordinances as given in question 325, to mean what they do in the proof-text, Heb. 10 : 1, namely, the sacrifices of the Levitical ceremonial in general, then again, *all* the sacrificial types of Christ under the old dispensation, were *mere figures and shadows*, and neither seals nor mediums of any gospel blessing whatever—then they were not "our schoolmaster unto Christ." But God calls circumcision his covenant between himself and Abraham, and St. Paul designates it "the *sign* of circumcision," and "a seal of the righteousness of faith which Abraham had, yet being uncircumcised." St. Paul also declares that "the law" (ceremonial chiefly) "was our schoolmaster unto Christ." And in Leviticus, chap. 4, vs. 20, 26, 31 and 35, and in chap. 5, vs. 5, 10, 13, 16 and 18, it is repeated no less than eight times, after the priest had made the atonement: "and it shall be forgiven them," or, "it shall be forgiven him."

Whilst then, the ordinances of the Old Testament were "shadows," or types of "good things to come," and possibly not as clear in their meaning as those of the New Testament, they were nevertheless, equally with the latter, signs and seals and mediums of gospel blessings.

The *ninth* requisite is—*In addition to the printed proof-texts, others ought to be indicated by chapter and verse*, so that those who have the time and inclination may have the necessary references to enable them more carefully and thoroughly to study the word of God on the subject under consideration. And I would add, that occasional references to other books than the

Bible would be an important desideratum. Also, occasional, suggestive and explanatory footnotes for the catechist, would be highly appreciated.

The *tenth* requisite, is—*The catechism should employ, as far as possible, the same terms throughout, to express the same truth.* This is highly necessary that the catechumen may obtain clear views of doctrine, free from all mental confusion.

Luther, in his introduction to his Smaller Catechism, insisted very strongly on the constant use of the same words, not only in the text of the five parts of the catechism, but also in the explanatory questions and answers, insisting that not a single syllable be changed, and for the same purpose as above stated.

Nothing renders an author so distasteful even to the educated reader, as a violation of this test, making it often necessary to compare page with page and expression with expression, in order to understand his use of certain terms, whilst nothing makes the perusal of others more pleasant and agreeable than the use of the same terms to express the same ideas. How much more, then, is this rule necessary in a catechism for the indoctrination of our youth. As an illustration, I will refer again to the indiscriminate use of the terms—redeem, secure, purchase, deliver, preserve—as noticed on a previous page. Another instance may be given. In Dr. Schmucker's catechism, we have the evidences of justification, to consist, first, of our inward experiences—"peace with God, a joyful sense of pardoned sin, the love of Christ shed abroad in the heart, and the consciousness of having been created a new creature in Christ Jesus;" and then, in the same answer, they are, to others as well as to one's self, "a new and holy life" * * or as given in the next answer, "our good works."* This is confusing. But more—neither of these is the primary evidence of our justification, for they can only show themselves as fruits of our personal knowledge of justification by a more radical and vital evidence. This evidence is, *first*, the fact that I have, as a lost, condemned sinner, cast myself upon Jesus Christ for salvation, taking him as my only and all-sufficient Saviour; and *secondly*, that having

*See questions 326, 327.

done so, God himself pronounces over me his own perfect absolution—"God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life"—"He that believeth on the Son of God, hath everlasting life." The other evidences, as fruits, are confirmatory of this; but when, as is often the case, we begin to doubt these, we must ever again fall back upon the primary and vital fact. This can never fail us.

The importance of making this distinction clear to our catechumens, can not be overestimated.

We will now apply these tests somewhat more fully, to a few of the catechisms that have been offered to our churches.*

Before doing this, we may say in general, however, that the catechisms thus to be tested, all have much to recommend them, whilst yet, no one of them comes up fully to our ideal of a good Lutheran catechism.

Dr. Schmucker's fails utterly on the first test—it gives us not the least recognition of Luther's Catechism, except by two brief sentences in the introduction. It does not make a single quotation from Luther, not even on the subject of human depravity, nor on the Lord's Prayer, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper. In short, it is no Lutheran catechism. As to the second test, it has the requisite comprehensiveness, but it lacks the brevity and simplicity which are necessary for catechumens. It is rather a short body of theology for theological students and adult church-members. The third test is not applicable in this case, as it does not give the text of Luther's catechism at all. As to the fourth, the doctrinal statements, whilst scriptural, do not, by any references or quotations, prove them to be in harmony with our Lutheran confessions. On the fifth and sixth tests, it is good, giving clearly the vital doctrines of salvation, and also a natural system adapted to our Christian experience.

In regard to the seventh test, it is too suggestive—it leaves *too much* to be explained to the catechumens. Under the eighth and ninth tests, we find its chief excellence as a cate-

*Those of Drs. Schmucker, Morris, and Conrad, and also that of our General Synod.

chism—it furnishes a sufficient number of appropriate proof-texts quoted in full.

On our first, second, and fourth tests, the other three catechisms are faithful, recognizing Luther's Catechism as their basis, being also sufficiently comprehensive, brief, and simple, and sound in their doctrinal statements. They meet also the seventh test of suggestiveness. Under the third requisite, I have already called attention to faulty translations, and also shown how they apply to these several catechisms.

In regard to the fifth test, our General Synod's catechism brings out very clearly and forcibly in its VI. Part, our ruin by sin and our deliverance through Christ and the Holy Spirit, and then, in a few brief additional questions, it gives us a rehearsal of the true and only way of salvation, (questions 108–119).

This is one amongst its chief recommendations—and I have not noticed this feature in any other catechism.

The catechisms of Drs. Morris and Conrad do not meet this requisite as fully as that of our General Synod, which any one will see by a careful comparison.

To show how the General Synod's catechism will endure our sixth test, of a natural order of salvation, I will give a brief generalization of the 16 questions of the VI. Part.

In questions 1 to 43, we have Man: his natural state, his origin—God: his existence, nature, physical attributes, works, moral attributes—Man: origin of his depravity, creation of our first-parents, their constituent parts, his original state of innocence, his fall, its author—the devil and angels in general: especially the apostasy of devils, their essential nature after the fall, their employment, their aim in the seduction of mankind—Man again and his fall: the nature of Adam's fall and how manifested, his loss, his state after his fall, the hereditary consequences to all his posterity.

In this part, as will be noticed, things are considerably mixed—the natural order is interrupted.

The remaining part in questions 44 to 169, contains an excellent order of salvation, in the following topics—Sin, Salvation, Our Redeemer; The Atonement; The application of the pur-

chased salvation; Man and the Holy Spirit; Man and baptism as a means of grace; Man as fallen from his baptismal covenant by wilful sin, and the word of God as a means of grace; The special order of salvation by repentance and faith, also genuine repentance; The two classes of men; The believer fortified against backsliding, or relapsing into wilful sin; Man and the Lord's Supper as a means of grace; The believer's trials and conflicts; The four last things.

The catechisms of Drs. Morris and Conrad fail in this natural order, from their following the order of Luther's catechism throughout—a necessary consequence as previously shown.

On the eighth, ninth, and tenth tests, these three catechisms are, on the whole, satisfactory, in the correctness of their language and their proof-texts. In the General Synod's, however, the proofs are given only by reference, and occasionally they are not legitimate, neither are they always the best when they are legitimate. This is a great defect.

We will here call attention to a few more points in Dr. Conrad's catechism. Under the third commandment, it would be very desirable to have a father's duties enforced towards his children, servants, and even his cattle, and also the Nation's duties towards its servants, its aliens ("the strangers") and its subjects in general, in regard to the observance of the Sabbath. The 79th and 80th questions should be combined, for we can not "dishonor" our parents without at the same time "displeasing" them, and vice versa. Question 59: "How do you know there is a God?" Answer: "By the insight of reason, the testimony of his works, and the declarations of his word." Even if there does exist such an evidence for the proof of God's existence, as "the insight of reason," surely it is not the one that should be first presented to our youthful catechumens. To my mind there is no evidence of any value on this point either from the insight of reason, or from an innate knowledge of God, except possibly to students advanced in scientific and rational studies. The true and natural order of evidence is clearly this: The universal belief in the existence of a God amongst all nations, handed down from father to son, and orig-

inally given by God himself to our first parents in the garden of Eden, and afterwards continued to the patriarchs both before and after the Flood, and thus, (though obscured but not entirely obliterated)* handed down by tradition amongst all nations to the present day. This universal belief is then confirmed by the works of nature, by miracles, by the fulfillment of prophecy, and finally by the ennobling influences of Christianity on individuals and nations. All this is readily comprehensible to our youth.

Although Dr. Conrad inserts the text of Luther's catechism in full in the beginning of his book, he fails afterwards, in his development, to give us Luther's explanatory questions and answers, except in two instances—on the first and third commandments. This is to be regretted, for as a Lutheran catechism, it ought to recognize fully Luther's explanations—*first*, by giving in each case, his own explanatory answer on every main question; and *secondly*, by then developing Luther's own explanation, using his own language and order as far as consistent with a connected order of truth.

This has several very important advantages—*First*, as already shown under the first plan to attain a natural order of salvation. This would materially aid the catechumen in retaining the entire body of the catechism. *Secondly*, as far as comprehensiveness and brevity are concerned, nothing better can be done than to develop fully Luther's own explanations.

I would like to see brought out also, in connexion with Luther's explanations of the commandments, the essence of natural depravity and the necessity of regeneration as a necessary requisite to keep the commandments. By comparing these explanations with Art. II. of our Augustana, we will see how they imply both these doctrines as they are there inculcated. Such an explanation might be placed at the close of the ten commandments; and although there partly anticipated, it could be called up again at its proper place in connexion with the third article of the Creed.

In conclusion, we may be allowed to express our decided

*Rom. 1 : 18–32.

preference for the fourth plan as indicated under our sixth requisite, because, 1. It presents us at once with a systematic outline of doctrine and duty in perfect harmony with the plan of salvation; and it does this without any deviation from the integrity of Luther's catechism, simply by a few slight changes in the arrangement of its matter and parts. 2. It thus also avoids the two defects of the first plan—its want of harmony in its several parts with the orderly appropriation of religious truth for the development of a healthy and vigorous Christian life and experience; as also its inadaptability to the needs and circumstances of many pastors. Besides, it gets rid of supplementary additions for development and explanation, as required in the second plan. 3. In adopting the third plan—namely, following strictly the order of Luther's catechism in our development and explanations, and at the same time aiming at giving a natural and practical order of salvation—we constantly find ourselves in the awkward and unenviable position of trying to do what is impossible to be done. Our fourth plan steers clear of this awkwardness and consequent failure. And 4. It combines, in short, all the advantages of the other three plans, whilst it readily avoids all their chief defects.

And now, may we hope and pray that this exhibit will have weight in influencing our General Synod to inaugurate the necessary measures, at its approaching convention at Omaha, to furnish our district synods and churches with a first class Lutheran Catechism.

ARTICLE VI.

THE CHURCH AND THE LABOR PROBLEM.

By Rev. Charles S. Albert, A. M., Baltimore, Md.

Every age brings its own problems. They are usually solved after a great many blunders have been committed, a number of provisional theories propounded, tried and found wanting. Slowly the truth evolves itself, becoming a little clearer through each successive attempt until at last a reasonable working theory is found.

It is apparent to thoughtful men that the relation of Labor and Capital is one of the greatest practical problems of our day. It is needless to review the history of modern industry which explains the dissatisfaction and unrest of the laborer. These are fully treated in the standard works on the Labor-problem. It would lengthen this article too much to discuss the changed conditions of trade and industry, brought on by the introduction of labor-saving machinery; by over-production, with its forced intervals of idleness and consequent want; by the growth of vast corporations, which are responsible to law and humanity only in a general sense; by the influx of cheap laborers, facilitated by our rapid modes of communication and transportation, the telegraph, the railroad, the steam ship; by the rise of demagogues who influence the laborer to his disadvantage and their profit; by the growth of labor-organizations, whose principles are vague and experimental and whose objects have never been tested by the stern realities of life, which labor-organizations are of immense power as the country has found within late years.

The purpose of this article is not the discussion of these matters so much as the discussion of the Church's present duty to the laborer and capitalist.

We put the laborer first. The Church has a message to all men. With it there should be no respect of persons. It knows no class. It deals with man. Every one is measured not by

his worldly standing, but by his relation to God. The Lord calls the rich man who was given up to harvests and increase of wealth, "Thou fool." He put Lazarus the beggar in Abraham's bosom, the rich man in hell. He does not do that because the one was poor, the other rich, but because the one feared God, the other lived for this world. With Zaccheus, the publican, the rich man, he abides, for he is penitent and believing and sits down at the feast of rich Matthew who has left all to follow Him.

We put the laborer first, because the Church is ever on the side of the weaker. The power up to this time has been with capital and not with labor. Here in our land it has not been quite as apparent as in the older countries. The conditions have been different and are to a certain extent different to-day. There have been no privileged classes. We have been fettered by no traditions. The laborer could and still can, though with more difficulty, become in a few short years a capitalist. But, capital is through its great syndicates and corporations beginning to dictate its own terms to labor.

Labor has sought to meet this by its labor-organizations, which give the power of united effort to oppose the power of wealth. One man alone has little chance in a conflict with capital. Numbers give power and gain a hearing. "Organized labor, so long as its purposes are legitimate and the methods by which their aims are to be promoted reasonable and just, must command a certain measure of public confidence and respect. Indeed it seems the natural outgrowth and almost logical result of that condition of things with which labor finds itself confronted, and it seeks, in organization and consolidation, protection against the oppressions of counter-consolidation in the shape of corporate power. Corporations are aggressive and dangerous, not only because they represent large accumulations of wealth, for those who own them, as a rule, are not those who manage them, but because they are directed by a very few persons, and the edict of a president or board of directors inaugurates a policy which directly affects, for good or bad, thousands of its employees. It is the absolute power vested in a few hands to direct the mighty machine under their control that makes it capable of all the oppression and wrong which some-

times marks its mismanagement. The stockholders and bondholders, who really own the property, are not, as a rule, those who mould its policy or shape its methods, although the form is annually gone through with of electing officers. Sometimes, it is true, these very officers are themselves the owners of controlling interests, but as a general thing they own but little of the corporate property."

These are sensible utterances. It seems, therefore, that one of the first duties of the Church should be to recognize the position of the laborer, because of its weakness, and that it should not denounce as some of our religious newspapers have done the effort of the laborer to protect himself by organization. We are well aware that there have been very serious blunders and wrongs committed by labor organized, as in the case of the strike ordered in New York by District Assembly No. 49. Here too labor must learn by sad experience its weakness and through failure be taught better principles and methods. It has allowed its organization to be controlled by a secret conclave and a few leaders and managers. There has been developed, more than in large corporations, the tyrannical power of the few over the many. A few demagogues order strikes which cause untold misery to thousands and tens of thousands. By the present management, the union man has sold himself body and soul to his organization. He has surrendered his liberty, his conscience. There is need of a changed policy, wiser management, or organized labor in its present condition will fail entirely.

Granted all this, the Church should distinguish between organized labor unjustly and unwisely managed, over against the right and necessity of organized labor. To refuse this would put the knife to its own throat, as the history of the Church shows its organization at times perverted and corrupt. It did not demonstrate that the Church had no right to exist, but it demonstrated the need of reformation of organization.

It becomes clergymen to study the labor-organizations, that they may form a just estimate of them. There are undoubted evils as indicated above, yet sober study reveals them as educational in their tendency, as uplifting in social life, inculcators of morality. Few organization have so deliberately set themselves

against profanity and intoxicating drinks as labor organizations. It is the Church that should ever be just and charitable. Unless it will be to the laborer, it will lose influence and power with this great and numerous class of our population.

This leads us to ask whether the labor organization tends to drift away from the Church?

We take the unfavorable signs first. Their deliberative district assemblies are often held on Sunday. Under the leadership of Henry George, in his recent canvass for the mayoralty of New York, for the first time in the history of our country, political gatherings assembled on Sunday.

There are within their ranks, many avowed opponents to both the Church and Christianity. I say both Church and Christianity for some draw a distinction and despise the Church whilst they hold to Christianity. The bitterness of the utterances of many is surprising and terrible.

Then again, large numbers of the working men never find their way into church. They live outside of its direct influence even if they are moulded by its indirect influence. Almost every pastor in large manufacturing centres is compelled as he enumerates his congregation to admit that the numerical proportion of laboring men in the church is not equal to the numerical proportion they bear to the whole community. He will have a larger proportion of merchants, clerks, business men, teachers, professional men, etc., either as members or attendants, than of laboring men. This is certainly serious.

On the other hand, we ought not to forget that every great movement will have in it all shades of opinion and belief. The tares and wheat ever grow together. It were supreme folly to condemn a movement because we could cite instances of ungodly men in it. That would condemn the Church, for she has always had in her visible ranks hypocrites, unfaithful and even skeptics. Many laboring men are true and devoted Christians. They claim that the demands which labor makes to-day are Christianity applied,—its principles brought into actual life. They affirm that the trouble is not with the labor-movement that so many are outside of the Church but with the Church itself. It has failed, they say, to sympathize with them, it has been de-

voted too much to those who have money to support it. The Church has become too aristocratic. People are not respected unless they dress well and pay largely. The poor are sent to mission-churches and are not wanted among the more cultured and wealthy.

"One reason," (writes one of Washington Gladden's correspondents) "for not attending the larger churches, which have wealthy congregations and good ministers, is that they are composed of the class who hire men to work for them, and, of course, dress themselves and their families better than the mere wage-worker can afford to do. When we see our employers going to church in broad cloth and silk, and satin, and furs, and laces and ribbons, it is natural for the man with the faded and patched coat and the woman with the calico dress, to feel rather uncomfortable in the midst of such finery."*

There can, I think, be no doubt that this is not a good spirit, though there is a certain justice in it. It is not Christian, for it savors of "the lust of the eyes and the pride of life," but it ought to show the ministry that they need to remind the strong to bear with the infirmities of the weak, to teach boldly plainer dress in God's house, Christian fellowship in the congregation and during the week and to declare and maintain that the standard of the Church is character and not money. We need more simplicity and a wiser and more sympathetic Christian love.

On the other hand, Gladden points out very forcibly in his work on Applied Christianity, that there are weightier reasons than this.

"It is evident that the wage-workers, as a class, are discontented. They feel they are not getting their fair share of the gains of advancing civilization.

It is evident that they are becoming more widely separated from their employers in the social scale.

It is evident that the old relations of friendliness between the two classes are giving place to alienation and enmity.

It is evident that the working classes have the impression

*Applied Christianity, Gladden, p. 156.

that the churches are mainly under the control of the capitalists and of those in sympathy with them."

With feelings of this character, we can well understand how very difficult it will be to induce the laboring man to enter the churches. He founds his objection really on justice. He does not receive that which he is entitled to in the matter of wages. Too large a share of the profits go to the wealthy, too little to the laborer. He remains poor, the rich become richer. How can he worship with men who do not give him justice? He does not care for friendship so much as he cares for justice.

He may be wrong, but these are his beliefs. We as ministers cannot well secure their attendance upon our churches until we either remove real evils, at least range ourselves against them, or, by a larger declaration of the truth, convince the laboring man he is wrong.

We must be willing therefore to study this whole movement, and as a Church seek to bring the principles of Christianity to bear upon the capitalist and the laborer.

First of all, the Church should insist and teach that there is a higher law than the law of supply and demand. Adam Smith in his celebrated work, *On the Wealth of Nations, its Nature and its Causes* (1776) laid down as the law of trade, simply, the law of supply and demand. We are to exclude moral requirement and act on a purely selfish basis. We are to buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest market. The higher humanity is not to enter into our treatment of employees. All is to be based on selfishness. Free competition is demanded. The state must not interfere. The sole duty of the state is to remove restrictions which fetter individual liberty and make free movement and life impossible. "For Adam Smith regards it as a law of nature, that every one knows best how to manage his own affairs, and that the economical activity of the individual, though put in motion by the spring of self-interest, by care for his own advantage, must nevertheless lead to what is most beneficial to the common prosperity; that each, while laboring for himself, is at the same time laboring for the whole." Whilst there is truth in these propositions they must be modified.

Carried to its legitimate conclusion, it means the strong will oppress the weak. It brings evils, employment of children, no regard for the health of employees, wages reduced to the lowest, according to Ricardo's iron law.

How terrible were the words of Sir William Pitt, when the English manufacturers complained that they were not able to compete with foreigners, "Take the children." Since then so many children have been sacrificed to the modern Moloch, trade, that governments have been forced to interfere, despite Adam Smith's law, and protect the children. There is a higher law, the law of humanity as given by Christ Jesus. It is that which the Church needs to proclaim, to enforce it by argument and life.

The law of supply and demand is not a sufficient law in dealing with the labor of man. He is a moral agent. Of him more than machine labor is required, interest in his work, thoughtfulness for his employer, fidelity in the performance of labor. An engineer does not bring simply his labor to the driving of his locomotive. He brings a faithfulness, vigilance and courage which is far beyond the law of supply and demand. It is imperative that moral obligation be recognized by Christian employers and men be dealt with according to the law of supply and demand, modified by the law of Christian obligation, regard to the *man* who toils.

2. The Church should insist on the responsibility of wealth. Wealth is power. It is a Christian power when rightly used, in accord with the law of God. The administration of wealth brings so great responsibilities that it becomes a very difficult business, so difficult that an amount of thought, study and conscience enters into it which few undertake. Conscientious use of wealth needs the study of social science and the like topics.

The wisest charity is that which calls out a man's energy, self-respect and moral strength. It is accomplished not by money-gifts, soup houses, charities, but by increased opportunities, better wages, improved homes, cheerful surroundings, care for operatives in the factories, regard for health, means of culture moral and intellectual.

The workman in general is careless and wasteful, his appetites

coarse and sensual, his amusements not elevating, or even restful, but have those, who might have helped him by wise counsel and judiciously directed his leisure hours, troubled or concerned themselves about him?

Immense fortunes which, out of their large incomes, give great sums to charities, if they have been amassed by the payment of low wages to the laborers, thus securing high profits to employers, do not accomplish the same good that a different policy might have secured, viz., the policy that sought to share its profits with the laborer by wise and judicious expenditure in his behalf and increased wages to him. This is the truer charity as it elevates our fellow-men and cultivates his self-respect and independence of character.

"Masters give unto your servants that which is just and equal."

3. The Church should insist upon the brotherhood of man with employers. There is need of personal interest in the men and their families, sympathy in their struggles and Christian love to them as brethren in Christ, in reality or possibility. "The strong should bear the infirmities of the weak." Our early industries were characterized by personal interest. Manufactories were small. Each employer knew personally his workmen, their families and their prosperities and also reverses. Then an employer who cared for his hands was secure. Sympathy and affection bound them together. Strikes were rare. It was hard to contend with the man who visited the families of his workmen in distress, who encouraged every laudable effort of progress and who recognized his workmen as brethren.

How changed to-day! Our great manufactories and corporations employ hundreds and thousands for whom they care less sometimes than the machines they use. The machine, if worn out, must be replaced with money, the workman if he contracts sickness in their employ can bear his own adversities and can be replaced by another without cost. The machine is, therefore, better cared for than the man.

There is little personal interest. The men are simply classed as workmen. Their outside life, their homes, their families all unknown. Is it remarkable that those who are thus selfishly bound together need so little to stir up strife and enmity?

There is need of more personal interest, the out-put of sympathy and love. The business man had better contract his operations and leave time for the cultivation of personal interest, sympathy and love, than to enlarge his fortune. In the one case he will be "rich toward God," the other "rich in the things of this life." Too often Lazarus lies at the door and the wealthy make no effort to bridge over the difference between them and treat him, "rich in faith," as a brother.

On the other hand the Church is the champion of no class. Her message is to all men. She needs to speak the truth to working men also.

1. The Church must protest against the principle that an organization is superior to conscience. No man has a right to obey man rather than God. When he belongs to an organization that orders him to do wrong, to disobey the dictates of his conscience, he has, after protest disregarded, but one resort, to leave the organization. There are, in the present Labor-unions, tyranny and demagoguery. The masses are under the control of an irresponsible few. Until these things are remedied there can be no true progress. Failure is bound to come. No movement based upon palpable wrong can succeed.

2. The Church must teach that there is diversity of gifts. All men cannot be alike, simply because it is in the very constitution of human society There are the leaders and the led. Brain power and executive ability are gifts and cannot be manufactured to order. There are the hosts of industry, and there are captains of industry. Prof. Ely writes to laboring men, "Cast aside envy, one of your most treacherous foes. Reject every thought of leveling down. Cultivate an admiration for all genuine superiority. While all the monstrous inequalities of our day can by no means be upheld by good men, while many of these inequalities, the fruit of evil, can beget only evil, remember that nothing more disastrous to you could happen than to live in a society in which all should be equals. It is a grand thing for us that there are men with higher natures than ours, and with every advantage for the development of their faculties, that they may lead in the world's progress, and serve us as examples of what we should strive to become. It will not take

you long, if you think earnestly about this, to become convinced of this. It is well for the small farmer to have a rich neighbor to take the lead in the use of expensive machinery, the introduction of blooded stock, and in other experiments, which, if disastrous, would ruin a poor man."*

Captains of industry have, by their peculiar talents, accomplished much. Railroads have opened the land, increased wealth, facilitated transportation and enabled every laboring man to live better and cheaper.

There is a diversity of gifts and there will always be inequalities, but inequalities that tend to our advancement, well-being and happiness.

3. The Church should teach the laboring man that Christianity is the friend of labor. To the heathen, labor was a disgrace, to the Christian, an honor. The Lord himself had been a carpenter, neither a beggar, nor a rich man, but one with the great body of mankind. The apostles too were laborers. "The greatest sages of antiquity, Plato and Aristotle, declare labor degrading to a free man; the apostle exhorts that every one labor with quietness and eat his own bread, and lays down categorically the principle: He who does not work, shall not eat. From this simple proposition has grown a new world that has wrought greater things than Plato and Aristotle ever saw."†

Christianity puts upon labor moral dignity and honor. It says all labor is of God, all labor that is good, and that he who accepts his earthly calling as from God is just as much a servant, a child of God as any other. "The qualitative difference of work is done away with." "Simple manual labor is, in a moral point of view, as valuable as that of the loftiest kind and most comprehensive extent. Everything depends not on what a man does but, on how he does it, with what motive and what spirit."

Probably much of our present trouble arises out of the fact that the laborer does not honor his work. He claims that he is as good as any other man and, in his heart, is possessed with an unchristian spirit and pride, feels that his lot is degraded and

*The Labor Movement in America, Prof. R. T. Ely, p. 1.

*Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism. Uhlhorn. p. 188.

that he is not as good as the man that does not labor. He is in this a Pagan but not a Christian.

The true friend of labor is Christianity. It has an ennobling message. It elevates the laborer and his work, sympathizes with his struggles, and knows him as a child of God, to be honored for his character and not for his earthly position.

4. The Church must teach the working man that every scheme founded on any other basis than a Christian basis, brings misery, failure and, unless prevented, destruction. Many labor-agitators are avowed opponents of Christianity. They hate it because its methods are not revolutionary. It abides by the law of development and slowly, as men grow in knowledge and capability, destroys vices and advances men. They hate it because it inculcates submission. They do not believe in obedience to the state or the laws. They hate it because it holds forth that every suffering hath recompense in the world to come. They would have no future, no hereafter that men would, in desperation, right suffering by violence.

Many labor-agitators are avowed Materialists. The world is all to them. Its rewards, its enjoyments are all. There is no law of right but the law of pleasure. All we fail to get here is lost forever. Death ends everything.

Such terrible teachings must bring their legitimate results, ruin and anarchy.

All labor-agitators are not like these as we gladly and cheerfully admit. But the Church should not fail to show this danger, and unto those whom her voice can reach, utter her warnings.

She should disclose to them that there can be no common brotherhood without a common Father. Brotherhood can be entered into only by those who are bound by this great tie. Common interests, selfish considerations may bring men together for a time, but the organization that appeals to selfishness and not to divine law and righteousness ever falls apart. The leaders of the French Revolution soon divided and the stronger put to death the weaker.

Brotherhood must have, to be permanent and abiding, the

basis of common Fatherhood, the Fatherhood in God, in Christ Jesus.

The Church therefore has a great duty to perform. It will require on the part of her ministers thought, patience, courage, sympathy, love, but the end is worth all toil and sacrifice, the salvation of men, the salvation of our land, the increase and upbuilding of the kingdom of Christ.

ARTICLE VII.

LUTHER'S SMALL CATECHISM EXPLAINED AND AMPLIFIED BY F. W. CONRAD, D. D.: A SYMPOSIAC.

In complying with the urgent solicitations of the Editors of the QUARTERLY to take part in this symposium, I confess to have been influence largely by personal considerations. I am thus afforded an opportunity of setting myself right before those who may happen to know that I was appointed with Dr. Conrad by the General Synod, when it was proposed twenty years ago to have a catechism somewhat after the style of the one now under review prepared and published under its authority. The committee appointed for that purpose consisted of Drs. Conrad, Sheeleigh and myself.

As is too often the case in committee work, so in this instance the labor was suffered to fall upon the chairman. It so happened, however, that he already, as he says, "had catechism on the brain," and with him it was strictly a labor of love. I soon begged to be excused by the General Synod from serving on the committee, and have no right, therefore, to claim any share in the praise now so liberally bestowed upon Dr. Conrad's Catechism. And I very much doubt whether any of the brethren who from time to time were appointed as co-operating committees, etc., during the tedious history of the General Synod's connection with the movement, viz. Rev. Drs. H. N. Pohlman, S. S. Schmucker, S. Sprecher, A. C. Wedekind, H. Ziegler, L. E. Albert, Joel Swartz and M. Valentine, had anything more to do with its preparation than I had.

At every General Synod from 1866 to 1881 the "*Committee on the Development of Luther's Catechism*" played a more or less

conspicuous part in its proceedings, until, at the meeting in Altoona, in 1881, the whole matter was finally dismissed by the adoption of the following report:

"The committee on the Development of Luther's Catechism beg leave to report that, inasmuch as the plan adopted to provide an improved edition of Luther's Small Catechism, better adapted for general use, has proved impracticable, after a trial of many years, your committee respectfully asks to be discharged from further consideration of the subject.

F. W. CONRAD,
M. SHEELEIGH,
L. E. ALBERT."

And thus ended all connection of the General Synod with the aforesaid movement.

But this unpropitious action of the General Synod did not discourage Dr. Conrad, or prevent him from quietly completing his work, and he now presents to the Church the result of his patient and persevering efforts in this direction. He assumes the entire responsibility of the publication and is no doubt justly entitled to whatever credit it deserves.

And there are several features of his catechism that are highly commendable. In the first place, he has confined himself strictly to the explanation of *Luther's* catechism, *i. e.* to the original five parts, ignoring the various accretions that have been appended to it in multitudinous editions. Some of these, though added with the best intentions, have disfigured rather than improved it. And, in the next place, he has printed alongside of the original clauses, and also of his explanations of them, the appropriate scriptural proof passages.

It would be too much to expect that there should be no room for adverse criticism in the case of a publication of this kind in a Church like ours, where there is so great diversity of opinion and practice. The accuracy of some of his definitions and the relevancy of some of his scriptural quotations may well be called in question. But it is gratifying to observe that the Doctor has been careful to avoid giving any countenance to the altogether un-Lutheran expositions of Lutheranism that have characterized some of the so-called Lutheran catechisms heretofore published.

This manual will have to stand upon its own merits, as have those published upon individual responsibility heretofore, and it will probably contribute its share to THE ENGLISH LUTHERAN CATECHISM that will ultimately be recognized as the standard text-book for religious instruction *among all English-speaking Lutherans in our country.*

C. A. HAY, Gettysburg, Pa.

It is no injustice to others to say, that in the Lutheran Church of the General Synod there is not a man of wider range in thought, and of greater diversity in his activities than Rev. Dr. F. W. Conrad;—that there is no name in the Lutheran Church more widely known to Americans—Catholic and Protestant—than his.

Twenty-five years of ecclesiastical journalism have given him opportunities such as come to few men; his ability as preacher, lecturer and organizer, has always been equal to the demands incident to his position, while his name is imperishably connected with collegiate and theological education. And now, to the long list of his diversified labors is added the latest product of his learning and industry—namely, CATECHETICS.

In Aug. 1886, Dr. Conrad published, at his own expense and *on his own responsibility*, a little volume of 147 pp. entitled "Luther's Small Catechism, explained and amplified." In making our examination of this work we will begin with the title-page: and the first thing to observe is, that the purpose of the author as indicated in the title, is a guarantee, that his effort has been, not to *modify and adapt*, but to *interpret* Luther to the thought of the age by explanation and amplification. The next thing on this page to attract attention is that it is published, not for *examination*, but "*for use* in classes, schools and families." To this end it has been advertised and offered in any quantities to Pastors and Churches of the General Synod, whose Constitution, Art. IV., Sec. 2, says: "the General Synod shall be charged with the duty of providing the books to be used * * in the catechetical instruction of the young."

The catechism thus entitled and published has been examined

by Doctors, Professors and Pastors and in their judgments published in the *Observer*, *uniformly* declared to be the long-awaited *desideratum*, which, however, cannot mean, that the Church has hitherto had no explanation and amplification in English;—that would not be true, as Dr. Morris as long ago as 1844 gave the Church such a work, and in 1863 Drs. Mann and Krotel, under appointment of the Pennsylvania Ministerium performed a similar labor, as have also others of less note since then. It must mean that this has an excellence to which the others did not attain. This excellence, as adjudged by these examinations, seems to consist in these three things: 1. That it prints the proof passages; 2. That these are so appropriate and the words so fitting, that the exact application of the text to the point in hand comes at once under the eye and the mind makes the clear connection of the truth taught, and the authority by which it is supported; and 3. That it is not a European book of the 16th century. As to (1), this is not a new feature; as to (2), there may on examination and comparison, be difference of opinion,—as *e. g.* p. 27, Quest. 45, 1 Chron. 16 : 22 as *preceding* the answer to Quest. 47;—p. 101, Quest. 363, 1 Cor. 7 : 5 [an injunction about marital intercourse applied to the Holy Communion!—Ed.] p. 66, Quest. 220, The blood is precious because it *ransomed.* Is not the truth just the other way—namely, it ransomed because it was *precious?*—p. 67, Quest. 224, Is freedom from all pain, &c., the *result* of serving Christ *in heaven?*

And if (3) be true—then it is not "Luther's Small Catechism, explained and amplified," for unfortunately Luther's Catechism does come down to us from the 16th century; and it is certainly due from the man who would *interpret* him, not to misrepresent him.

In the preface the author tells us he has "for the convenience of parents" prefixed an *authorized* translation. This seems to be the translation of Dr. C. F. Schaffer, approved and published by the Penna. Synod in 1855, and "strictly adhered to" by Drs. Mann and Krotel.

In continuing this examination the writer would call attention to such points as in his judgment seem to call for revision, and restatement.

1. Should the answer to question 10 be accepted as a correct definition of the *significance* of baptism?

2. On pp. 21, 22, Is the logical form the best possible one? Note the answer to question 17 *defines* a *law* of God; 18 *affirms* that the *laws* of God are of several kinds and in 19, 20, 21 the *kinds* are respectively defined. Having done this, the author declares, then by a "universal affirmative," question 22, that "*the laws* of God are *binding upon all men*," which, however, proving too much necessitates resort to the "particular negative" in question 23 for which the mind is not prepared, the whole leading to inextricable confusion.

3. On p. 27 all of 47 and the latter clause of 48 express truth. But does it belong here?

4. Questions 237, 240, 242 and 384 lack precision. Of course our author is neither a Donatist nor a Puritan, who make the Church "throughout the whole world" to consist only of the regenerate. But, as the Church in the "whole world" is administered by men—for "we have this treasure in earthen vessels"—and as those who apply for her privileges must make their application to men: and if those only are entitled to her privileges who *are* in mystical union with Christ, and only those are to be confirmed who exercise *sincere* repentance, have *true* faith and do yield *hearty* obedience, who is to *discern* whether applicants possess these *required* qualifications? "I, the Lord search the heart."

5. Question 315 conditions the effects of the sacraments absolutely upon faith. Question 316 makes their *intrinsic* efficacy to depend, not upon the *faith* of the recipient, but upon their *inherent* constitution. There is manifestly a confusion of thought here: "intrinsic efficacy" possibly confused with the "validity" or the "integrity" of a sacrament. Schmid's Dog., pp. 549, 562, also 520, 521.

6. In reference to question 321, we would ask whether this is the Lutheran or Reformed conception of the Word and Sacraments as *means of grace?* Compare Augs. Conf., Art. V.; Chemnitz in Schmid's Dog., pp. 550, 551, also 517–524 with Hodge's Syst. Theol., Vol. 3, pp. 501, 502, 505, 507.

7. Question 328, If the element in baptism is not water,

what is it? Luther does not affirm that the *element* in baptism is not water—but, that *baptism*, *i. e.* the sacrament, is not *simply* water. The element is and remains water, even as the elements of bread and wine, which, "by Christ's appointment become the medium of communicating the body and blood of Christ," are and remain bread and wine.

8. Question 345. "It *may not be* absolutely necessary *to salvation*, but ordinarily necessary" (not to salvation) but "to *prove* the *genuineness* of our faith." Should not the answer be definite—it *is* or is not—why and when, not. Note—that it (baptism) is ordinarily necessary "*to prove* the *genuineness* of our faith." This is not in harmony with question 318—which states the *design* of the sacraments to be very different from the above. And, by the way, can baptism, in the nature of the case, be *proof* of the *genuineness* of faith?

9. Question 357. Is this presence of Christ in the sacrament of the Holy Supper, which is affirmed by reason of his Omnipresence—what the Lutheran Church means by "a sacramental presence?"

The additions which make the little volume a manual for Lutheran families, are a very commendable feature of the work.

JOHN A. EARNEST, Mifflinburg, Pa.

Several pastors, whose active ministerial experience dates back no less than fifteen years, were recently discussing catechisation, when one of them ventured the assertion that the ideal hand-book for religious instruction had not yet been published—at least not in an English translation; that some one eminently successful in training the youths of the church might have such a manual prepared, but from modesty or financial timidity resisted the temptation to offer it for publication.

The argument turned on the arrangement of a catechism to which the young mind would readily respond. It was maintained that the Introduction should embody, briefly, the essential historical facts of the Bible, and Religion in general—true and false. Then, since the child instinctively, if not logically, inquires first after the source of its being, *Theology* should be the starting point in a system of instruction for all learners.

Here would be the proper place for the I. Article of the Creed, followed by the Decalogue. Naturally, *Anthropology* would be the next step, because everything that concerns man—from his innocence and high estate through his fall and ruined state to his hopeless destiny—must be vividly impressed by the doctrine of God and his law. Now the inquirer is prepared for *Soteriology* where the need, plan, author and conditions of salvation can be very efficiently presented in the light of the II. Article of the Creed. Then logically would follow the doctrine of the *Holy Spirit*—the *Means of Grace*, the Church, the Word, Prayer, the Sacraments, all enforced by the III. Article of the Creed. *Eschatology* would appropriately conclude the course of instruction and fitly prepare the catechumen for the solemn rite of confirmation.

No originality is claimed for this idea except that of getting it into the QUARTERLY. Said pastors being at present unprepared to meet the fire of criticism their plan would rouse, unanimously welcome—as an advance in catechism-making—the work of Dr. Conrad.

It is manifest that the author in his explanations and amplifications allowed himself to be governed by three very important principles: 1. That conservatism which holds to the original five-fold order reasserted and preserved by Luther in his Smaller Catechism which has become the adopted system of doctrine in the Lutheran Church. Hence there is no uncertainty as to whether our children should be trained according to Lutheran custom, or after that demoralizing latitudinarianism for which any method is satisfactory only so it is undenominational and non-liturgical. 2. The importance of *memorizing* the main truths of salvation as against the growing looseness of some modern catechists, whose instructing consists of "talks" euphemistically called "lectures," and adds to the fatal pruriency of too many catechumens for entertaining novelty. To do effectual catechetical work, an authoritative not an elective system is necessary. When Peter admonished the *diasporoi* to be prepared—*Etimoi* (there is a difference between being ready and being prepared) to give answer, he had in mind no such answers as are so common among us, but an "apology" for the hope that

was within them. 3. The necessity of tact, conscientiousness and faithful oversight on the part of the instructor who is to present at every meeting of the class the ripest results of independent lesson-study; he is to fall back on his own resources in a devout and intelligent preparation that he may absolve himself from the humiliating charge made against the doctors of pre-reformation times. His sight of the class is to be an *insight*, in order that he may have the grand advantage over him who looks upon those he is training for the Master's service, but does not see them. There is no room in this new catechism for that mechanical, or official and priestly management of the young people which is largely responsible for the unconverted confirmants in our churches.

So true is this that a few prominent features of Dr. Conrad's method are worthy of special emphasis.

The key-note of the whole matter is struck in question 10 on page nineteen where baptism is accentuated as the act of admission into covenant relationship. How can that be an authorized book of instruction in the Church or a systematic, consistent Lutheran catechism, which ignores the very first element in Christian nurture? It would be an absurdity. Certainly the baptized children are the Lord's children. Whose else? Who would be so incomprehensibly obtuse as to want to nurture the devil's children? Yet Christian teachers are bold enough to dispute Cotton Mather's proposition: "The Lord has not set up the Church as merely that a few old Christians may keep one another warm while they live and then carry the Church with them when they die; but that they may nurse successively another generation * * to stand in His kingdom when they are gone." Nurse them! An elementary development is admitted. But from what starting point? How marked is the element of weakness in that man's system who pronounces baptism a mere formality! It certainly is not only unLutheran but unscriptural, not only contrary to historical Christianity but common sense to assume that the baptized children are no better than heathen. F. W. Robertson was not the only one to whom prayer was natural from the earliest dawn of intelligence. They

were adults to whom the Saviour said: "Unless ye be converted and become as little children."

From this stand-point it may be safely maintained that catechisation is a training *in* the Church not *for* the Church. This is forcibly suggested by Dr. Conrad's arrangement throughout. The age demands symmetrical character-building with the mortar well tempered. If the head of the family will accept his share and the learner will not despise the devotional portion, the teacher need not fear that his work will be disappointing. This is the only solid basis for true education. In proportion as the cry for non-denoninational schools and colleges—which Dr. Hodge calls non-religious—becomes louder, the "watchmen of the nation" need to awake to their responsibility. Since the perpetuity of the state depends upon the *religiously* educated people, parents could do no better than turn to the indoctrinization of their children in essential, revealed truth. But the adage of the old nurse quoted by Sara Coleridge in one of her bright letters, has become an accepted sedative in our day: "O Lord, ma'am, it is not easy to kill a baby." It is hoped by many—and they solace themselves and pacify their consciences by this hope—that by some mysterious power the children will somehow survive the attacks of all spiritual foes until they are old enough to "go through the process!" It is one thing to argue about the necessity of conversion but quite another to obey the masterly old maxim: "Train up a child in the way he should go."

Hence the additional remark is here in place that the selection and arrangement of the "proof texts" recommend the needed catechism—not their number but their suitableness. "You read no Scripture," said the wide-awake hearer. "The length of my sermon would have prolonged the service," replied the self-complacent preacher. "But why did you not leave out some of your stuff and give us the word of God?" Homely comparisons may put a very eloquent declaimer in an awkward position. Let not the most fluent catechist take it for granted that his expositions are preferable to the fastening of thought by divine teaching. One of the most accomplished teachers—Nissen—always fixed the "points" in his own mind in order that he might

verify the memoriter recitations of his scholars without the book. The entire Bible is before the teacher but he wants to imitate the true builder who does not insist on the quantity but the carefully chosen and closely fitting stones; the spiritual house is to go up by the material taken from the rich and inexhaustible quarry. Or, to give place to Bushnell here, "God's word is fit bread for children; they can make more room for gospel than we, and take in all precious thoughts of God more easily."

One thing however should be remembered by the catechism makers: the great mass of young people in the catechetical classes are not mentally disciplined; which does not imply that they are satisfied with the "mentally weak and the morally flimsy" and that in order to train them we must be childish. But it must be emphatically repeated that they can comprehend God in Christ far better than they can the technicalities and terminologies of learned expositors. The "deep things of God" may not be too deep for them but some of the questions and answers we have seen in catechisms are unfathomable abysses to them. Theology they can understand, but hair-splitting speculations are so many mysteries for them. They do not stagger at great truths and principles when they are luminously stated. The only simplicity they want is that of purity and clearness. He who makes the catechism for the Church is like unto him who writes the songs for the nation. After all there is no cheap way of making Christians of our children. Nothing but to practically live for it makes it sure. To be Christians ourselves. Ah, there is the difficulty!

J. C. Koller, Hanover, Pa.

Few men are good catechists. Fewer still, by large odds, are competent to write a good catechism. The sixteenth century produced but one; and not another, since then, has commended itself to general approval, though their name be "legion." The difficulty is inherent in the subject itself. *It is the reduction of the strong meat for men, to the milk for babes.* It is not hard to make clear things cloudy; but to make cloudy things clear and understood by children, requires not only great intellectual resources, but a very giant in literary humility.

Dr. Conrad's attempt in this direction, is indeed, praiseworthy, and taken all in all, is no mean success. It is *the* work of the Dr. that will outlive him longest and benefit the Church of his love most. Yet it must not surprise him to be candidly told that the "ne plus ultra" of Luther's catechism explained, is still a thing of the future. His effort is a great step in the right direction. Future editions may make it as nearly complete as human endeavors are likely to be. Friendly criticism may, possibly, contribute something towards this desirable end. In that spirit these lines are penned.

It must be remembered that this is not an original or new catechism. It purposes simply to "explain and amplify Luther's Small Catechism." If now I ask myself the question: what was Luther's design in preparing his catechism? The only correct answer is: to furnish *elementary religious* instruction to the ignorant of his day, whether old or young. Whatever other purposes this little book has been made to subserve since then, whether as a compend of theology, or as an integral part of the confessional writings of our Church—all which may be right and proper—these things were not in the author's mind when he wrote the book. Accordingly he heads each of the five parts thus: "*As a house-father should teach his servants in the simplest way.*" The house-father is the designated teacher; the family, comprehensively, the servants, specifically, are the designated scholars. Whoever loses sight of this cardinal point, whether house-father or pastor, will miss every time attaining the object Luther had in view when he wrote this book. Now, as then, its *design is elementary religious instruction.* It is the first book of positive religious teaching placed in the hand of the child. It is his religious primer. Great plainness of speech and severe simplicity of style must characterize such a book. In this respect Luther's catechism is a model. And it is just here where Dr. Conrad's "explanations" are open to criticism. It is not difficult to account for this defect in the Dr's. book. For nearly a quarter of a century he has been out of the pastoral office; and for the last 28 years he has wielded the editorial pen in discussing the profoundest problems

in Church and State. An elevated and ornate style has become natural to him. Besides all this, he is a born metaphysician. Almost every line that he has written bears traces of this his birth-right. Nevertheless, whilst all this may account for the defect, the defect is there and should be remedied.

Let an example or two illustrate my meaning. I open the book at random and my eye rests on the 23d question: "Why are not the ceremonial laws of the Jews binding on us?" "Because as types and shadows of a temporary dispensation, they were abrogated at the advent of Christ and passed away with the introduction of the gospel." Now this is a most excellent answer for theological students to handle, but how is it for a child 10, or 12, or 14 years old?

I let my eye run up to the next question above: "Why are the laws of God binding upon all men?" "Because they are based upon the nature of God and his relations to man, and were reaffirmed by Christ, and can therefore neither lose their binding authority nor be changed." Capital answer! Could not be better for theological students. But how is it for Sunday-school boys and girls?

I turn over a leaf or two, to question 54: "What is it to conjure by the name of God?" "It is * * to appeal to God to secure his direct interposition in the accomplishment of superhuman ends." These examples taken at random, will illustrate my meaning.

Another remark: and this relates not so much to style as to the subject matter itself. Any "explanations" of Luther's catechism should have the questions and answers so arranged as to be the natural outgrowth of the text; having, like the branches of the tree, a living, unmistakable connection with the trunk. This will not only exclude all irrelevant matter, but will hold the mind of the learner in the focal light of the original text, until it is all aglow with the precious truth therein set forth. In this way the whole process of instruction will be like a chain, link fastened to link, idea blending with idea; aiding greatly the memory of the child and making catechisation a delight, instead of a dreaded task and burden, as at present. To walk or to rest in the refreshing shades of such banyan-tree-like groves of

truth, is a "consummation devoutly to be wished" for catechist and catechumen. "Hasten, Lord, the glorious time!"

Dr. Conrad has made marked advances in this direction. Still there is room for improvement.

These sentences are by no means to be construed as objecting to any independent discussion of any part of the catechism. In this direction Dr. Conrad has added greatly to the value of his catechism. His "Introduction" to the law, and his "Nature and Uses" of the law at the end, are like the head-light on the locomotive and the red light on the rear platform: the one pointing out how full of light is the way of obedience; and the other warning all who, recklessly or thoughtlessly, will run into the danger of wilful disobedience. So with reference to the other four parts, his prefixed or suffixed discussions are invaluable. That preceding the Lord's Prayer could only come from a heart that had the fullest assurances of the power, the privilege and the value of prayer, springing from a *life-experience* of prayer. His discussion of the sacraments is timely, temperate, truthful. The Church will not go wrong by believing and practicing what this catechism in all its parts sets forth.

Believing as I do, that the next edition will undergo a thorough revision, adapting questions and answers to the capacity of children and thus of all, whether young or old; removing some redundancies, and making the questions and answers generally pendent on Luther's text, I have no hesitancy in predicting that the next General Synod will hail with delight the opportunity of placing its *imprimatur* upon it and thus recommend it to the Church as the best book of the kind now in the English language.

A. C. Wedekind, New York.

The subject of *catechisation* has come to the front, and for some years has impressed itself upon the thought and conscience of our ministers. At synods and conferences, when methods of work are discussed, common questions are, "What catechism do you use?" "How do you conduct your catechetical classes?" Any one who is able to shed light on this subject is sure of an

earnest and appreciative audience. The great interest taken in Dr. Conrad's catechism shows how deeply this want is felt.

The greatest want however is not a good *catechism*, but good *catechists*. And a good catechism may be the means of raising up poor catechists. If the book before us be used as a *staff*, it will do good. If used as a *carriage*, it will hinder rather than help the cause of catechisation. A successful teacher has said, "a drop of life is worth more than an ocean of knowledge." Believing that no book, however good, can take the place of the living teacher, we estimate the value of a catechism by what it suggests rather than by what it contains.

The best catechism is one which each minister makes for himself. Given Luther's Catechism, the Bible History, the proof texts and the hymn book, the minister must give his class his own explanation and amplification if he wishes to attain the highest success in this important art. And yet such amplifications as the one before us have been used for three centuries with varying success and popularity, and within certain limits may be useful.

It would be easy to take up the book in detail and show from a thousand illustrations how in the critic's opinion the matter and manner of the catechism might be improved. But this would not be doing justice to the author or to the readers of the Review. This catechism has merit. But we want to avoid the error of supposing that it is the *summum bonum* of catechetics and to ascertain the sphere of its usefulness.

In the first place, the catechism is not intended for little children, and therefore it is not necessary to criticise it from this standpoint. The language and forms of statement are not adapted to their comprehension. If the same catechism is to be used in schools, families and catechetical classes by children of all ages and different degrees of intelligence it might be well to indicate by two or three different kinds of type the questions which the different classes of children ought to learn.

It is evident that the author had in view the average intelligence of the members of catechetical classes, such as are preparing for admission to Church by the rite of confirmation.

Hence the theological terms and modes of expression which would otherwise be inadmissible are not entirely out of place.

Nor, in the second place, is it intended that the answers to the 391 questions of this catechism are to be committed to memory. It would not only be imposing a useless burden on the learners, but it would also be a pedagogical fault.

The time spent in learning these answers can be employed to better advantage in learning the exact words of scripture. And even if the memory would master and retain these answers, this dogmatic method of teaching would have the effect of stifling rather than of aiding the search after Christian truth.

But as a hand-book or a book of reference to be used in connection with the catechetical lectures, this catechism is suggestive and may be used with great advantage by teacher and scholars.

Among the minor points to which I take exception is the derivation of Whitsunday from White Sunday, (p. 128) for which there is not the slightest authority. And while the devotional books of other denominations are enriched by hymns from the land of Luther, it seems an excess of modesty for us Lutherans to omit them from our collections, especially when by using them we form a bond of union with our German-speaking parents and friends.

But aside from such small matters, and bearing in mind the danger arising from a servile use of any dogmatic form of statement, Dr. Conrad's catechism is an excellent little volume, for which he deserves and will doubtless receive the thanks of his brethren in the ministry.

G. U. WENNER, New York.

The value of a book is to be estimated not from its size or its cost, but from its purpose and its adaptation thereto. There is no book of merely human composition of more importance than a catechism on the Christian religion; for its place and work are fundamental for character and life. Whilst no merely human book is perfect, none requires this quality so much as such a catechism. Perhaps this is the reason so few have tried, and fewer still have succeeded, in making such a book. The

use of Luther's excellent Small Catechism has always been hampered, among English speaking people, by the great length of the answers found in it. Consequently there have been a number of attempts by individuals and committees, in various quarters, to adjust this catechism to the use of our churches in America. The most recent attempt in this direction is Dr. Conrad's "Luther's Small Catechism, Explained and Amplified."

After so many men, on all sides and in all positions, have praised this little book without stint, and it has been lauded from week to week in *The Lutheran Observer* as the great *desideratum* of our churches, it may seem presumptuous in us to question this judgment, or to point out deficiencies and errors in this catechism. On the other hand this same excessive laudation has led others to look more closely into so unparalleled a work and to be even less lenient to apparent faults than they would have been had the book been allowed modestly to speak for itself. Experience, moreover, leads us to be very chary of accepting a thing because of any names, however weighty, used to commend it. If a thing does not commend itself, no opinions of men can sustain it. Moreover, that same laudation may make it the more imperative, for the general good, that the other side be heard. There is, doubtless, much to commend in Dr. Conrad's catechism. It is the work of many years of effort, and it has gone through many experiences. Originating in the appointment of a committee by the General Synod long ago, it now comes before the public as Dr. Conrad's individual work. We desire here to record ourselves as good a friend of Dr. Conrad as any of those who have extravagantly praised his catechism, and it cannot be considered a personal matter that we feel called upon, in the brief space here given, to make some strictures upon his work. This little book is for the Church's use, and it is the Church that is to be profited or harmed by it.

1. In general, as to the style of the questions and answers of which a catechism should be composed. Every answer in a catechism should be a complete proposition, expressing the thought to be conveyed. It should involve the question so far as is necessary to that end; and the questions should be so framed as to allow this, with this in view. The Westminster

Shorter Catechism, of our Calvinistic friends, is a model in this respect. From beginning to end there is not an answer there that is not a complete proposition, and whoever has the answer has the question, without any effort to remember order or connection. *E. g.*, "What do the Scriptures principally teach?" Ans. "The Scriptures principally teach what man is to believe concerning God, and what duty God requires of man." "Into what estate did the fall bring mankind?" Ans. "The fall brought mankind into an estate of sin and misery." Every answer in that catechism makes complete sense. This is largely so in Luther's Catechism, properly translated, and in Frelinghuysen's "Order of Salvation." But Dr. Conrad has altogether neglected this very important matter in his catechism. There are only eleven answers in the whole book, aside from the Commandments of God and the Creed, that make complete sense of themselves. These are the answers to questions 34, 104, 175, 218, 224, 244, 266, 275, 319, 348, 382. For instance, what propositions of truth do these answers set forth: "Into the love of gratitude and of complacency," "To make false statements concerning him." "By the Holy Ghost," "We cannot," "Of Heaven"—and any others you may select. To have observed the point we make might have called for more type and more pages, perhaps, but it would have given us more the catechism we need.

2. There is an indefiniteness in many of the questions in this catechism. *E. g.*, "Why are the laws of God binding on men?" Now gravitation, magnetism, heredity, etc., are among "the laws of God:" does this question include these? "What is enjoined in this commandment?" is an oft repeated question in this book: but what commandment is meant? "What is the fear of God?" and "What are the different kinds of fear?" would be stated much more definitely in the form, What is it to fear God? and, What different kinds of fear are there? The question, "How does this commandment require us to love God?" might be answered in several ways, according as the "how" is understood. "What are some of the things belonging to God?" is a remarkable question. "How is this done?" is another. "How is the second commandment enforced?" is

asked. Well, in Pennsylvania and in many other States there is a law against profane swearing, and perjury is punished by the courts; does the question involve such enforcement? "Which day of the week is now kept as the Sabbath?" Before answering this one must ask, By whom?

3. There is an inexactness in many of the answers in this catechism. *E. g.*, "A catechism" is defined to be "A book of religious instruction in the form of questions and answers." But Bertini's catechism is not this, nor Jousse's: these are catechisms of music. There are catechisms of every science; they need not be "religious." So the definition of "A Creed" in this catechism gives a species for the genus. "Trust in God" is defined to be "such confidence in God as leads," etc. Why "*such?*" "Everything else that belongs to God" is said to be "included in the name of God." How are we, especially young people, to interpret this word "belongs" here? "To appeal to God to secure his direct interposition in the accomplishment of superhuman ends" is given as a principal definition of what it is to "conjure by the name of God." Yet surely we make such an appeal whenever we ask God to create in us a clean heart and renew a right spirit within us. A comparison of questions 190 and 191 gives us the strange statement that our Saviour "assumed the nature and condition of man" "under Pontius Pilate, the Roman governor." On p. 66 "Christ's blood is called precious" "because it was the ransom paid for our redemption." Surely this is putting the effect for the cause. On p. 67 "The declaration of the word of God" is said to be "that we shall be joint heirs with Christ." But God's word emphatically declares (Rom. 8 : 14–17, Gal. 4 : 7) that we *are* heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ. On p. 77 it is said that "Prayer consists in making our requests to God for such things as we need." Surely this is a very one-sided definition. Is prayer only begging? It is, alas, made too much so, and, instead of being taught this, people ought rather to be led to a higher plane of communion with God. On p. 84 it is said that, in the fifth petition of the Lord's Prayer, "We promise to forgive those who have injured or offended us and to return good for evil." Now here that is made a future contingency which God's word makes an ante-

cedent or contemporary condition. Jesus says (Mk. 11 : 25), "And when ye stand praying, forgive," etc., using the present tense, and in Matt. 6 : 12 the true reading is, as the Revised Version has it, "As we also have forgiven our debtors" [perfect tense], and the parallel passage, in Lk. 11 : 4, has it, "For we ourselves also forgive," etc., showing forgiveness as existing and a habit—but this is very different from a promise of what we are *going to do!*

On p. 78 the answer to the question, "Who can pray with confidence that their prayers will be heard?" is, "All true believers, penitent souls, and pious children." This brings to our mind the facetious division of mankind into "saints, sinners, and the Beecher family!"

4. Some of the questions and answers of this catechism come short of the truth, or, directly or indirectly, teach error. This is seen as early as on the 2d page of the book. Is it possible that we are to believe and teach that "the significance of our baptism" is that "I therein received my Christian name, and was presented to God by my parents, who entered into covenant with him for me"—only that, and nothing more? Why, the Baptists are ready to do as much as that for their children! The next answer says of the parents, "They promised that by the help of God I would renounce my sins, believe in Jesus Christ and obey the commandments of God." Now, if any have promised that, they have promised what, in the nature of the case, it is not in their power to fulfil: no one can "covenant and promise" what another will do. The writer of this is both a Lutheran and a parent, and, when his child was baptized, he promised no such thing as is above declared. See in our formula of Baptism (Liturgy of 1856) what he did promise. Further on in this catechism it is said of the engagements in baptism, "The obligations assumed can never be revoked." Then those unfortunate parents whose wilful children refuse instruction will be forever held as "covenant-breakers" because they could not fulfil the promise to deliver over their children as penitent believers. The answers in the first edition to the repeated question, "What advantages are conferred upon chil-

dren by baptism?" are very weak, and far below Lutheran doctrine on this subject; and, although the "Revised Edition" has improved some of the statements under the head "Of Baptism," the commonly received Calvinistic view—that in the baptism of children the covenant is made with the parents—seems to be the real view of the author. But Lutheran teaching is that the covenant in baptism is in all cases made with the subject of the baptism, whether child or adult. It is the child that is sealed with the seal of the covenant, made with it, not with the parents. Hollaz. says, "The primary design of baptism is the offering, application, conferring, and sealing of evangelical grace," and this is done to the person baptized, not to his parents: and, whilst it is the faith of the parents that brings the child thus to God, "We by no means grant," as Chemnitz says, "that infants who are baptized are either without faith, or are baptized on the faith of others." This catechism teaches (p. 20) that baptized children "*become* true Christians" at some other time and in some other way than in baptism. And the use of this word "become," here and on p. 108, question 391, and of the word "imposes," on p. 106, question 383, shows that Dr. Conrad has not weighed words as carefully as he should in making a catechism.

The worst defect of the book is that noted under this head; for it is a fundamental one and is no subversive of our Lutheran church life, that it is a thousand pities there should be here even an uncertain sound, now when our Church has been coming to a better self-consciousness and appreciation of her doctrines as preëminently scriptural. The little book, happily here, is inconsistent with itself on this point of baptism, since questions 372, 389, 390, and especially the changes made in the "Revised Edition," either state or imply the true doctrine.

Another important and strange error, in a Lutheran catechism particularly, is found on p. 49, question 144, where "the original design of the law" is stated, in the first edition, to have been "to confer eternal life," and in the "Revised Edition," to "offer eternal life," etc. Where in the world did Dr. Conrad learn this? His proof passages do not establish it, and the Scriptures expressly say (Gal. 3 : 21), "For, if there had been a law

given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law," and (Rom. 3 : 20), "By the law is the knowledge of sin." The law was given after the promise: the promise was of eternal life in Jesus Christ, and the purpose of the law, as stated in Gal. 3 : 24, was to be "our schoolmaster [pedagogue] to bring us unto Christ." No law of commandments can either offer or confer eternal life. The law of life is a very different sort of law, as both nature and the Bible teach.

Such are some of the defects, as they seem to us, of this catechism. We are truly sorry to see them, but feel bound to note them. A proper criticism of the book would require much more space than is here allowed us. We are fully convinced that a Committee of parents, pastors, and teachers, could greatly improve this catechism, or make a better one.

H. L. BAUGHER, Gettysburg, Pa.

Our examination of "*Luther's Small Catechism*, explained and amplified" by Rev. F. W. Conrad, D. D., has constrained us to join the large number of clergymen who have already publicly commended it.

It certainly is a great achievement in modern catechetics. It excels in arrangement, in the directness of its questions and the clearness and suggestiveness of its answers, in the fulness and relevancy of its proof-texts, in its practical and comprehensive expositions, and in its distinctively Lutheran, doctrinal and churchly character. All these characteristics have been recognized and commended in the various testimonials which have already been published. We have not as yet seen a single adverse criticism of the wonderful little book, which an enthusiastic admirer has termed "*A whole body of divinity in a nutshell, a complete manual of Evangelical Lutheranism, a brief, but comprehensive summary of Christian doctrine and practice; or the Augsburg Confession with its legitimate exponents epitomized.*"

The learned and gifted author is to be congratulated upon the excellent success which has attended his efforts to give to the Lutheran Church the catechism which our times demand.

We apprehend the difficulty of preparing an epitome which shall contain a complete body of divinity, and yet be so simple

as to meet the wants of children and youth. He who would succeed here, must be not only a thorough theologian, but also an adept in didactics.

The aim of the author has been to furnish a work for juvenile instruction, which would at the same time be adapted to the wants of the more advanced scholar and the church-member as a manual for devotion and Christian culture.

But to accomplish the latter end, it has been deemed necessary to sacrifice much of the simplicity demanded by the former.

Our juvenile, and in many places our intermediate classes, will lose interest in the study of a subject when they encounter such words as *abstract*, *intrinsic*, *inherent*, *super-sensual*, *Originistic*, *Capernaitic*, etc., and when they meet with statements of truth which are not readily understood.

The catechist who has to deal with those who have enjoyed but limited educational privileges, will appreciate a catechism which presents truth in the simplest possible forms.

It has long been our judgment that this instruction should be graded. We should have a serial catechism, or a series of catechisms, the last of which might serve as a manual for the Church.

The importance of this simplicity of language and statement may be realized, when we consider the prejudices which are entertained in many quarters against catechisation. A representative clergyman of the Presbyterian Church, on being interviewed with regard to this subject some time ago, remarked, "I do not think that the catechism is taught in many of our churches. *It is relegated, as it ought to be, to the theological seminaries where theology is taught.* It is not taught in our Sabbath schools. The children are taught out of the Bible, not out of the writings of men. I think it a great mistake to teach children the catechism as it was taught when I was a boy. We had to commit it to memory, and stand an examination in it *while we understood but little of the words used.* It made me hate it, and to hate Sunday and the Sunday-school."

We know of such prejudices in our own Church, and the catechism in use doubtless has much to do with their existence. Of the parts of the "New Catechism" we very much admire the

interesting, instructive and exhaustive discussion of the Apostles' Creed, the introduction to the Sacraments, the treatise on Confirmation, and the Appendix, which we consider invaluable for its information, and its able defense of the doctrines and practices of our beloved Church.

We have however, noticed several omissions, which we very much regret, to which we kindly call attention, hoping that they may be supplied in subsequent editions.

1. A discussion of the *Word of God* as the source of the truths taught in the catechism,—the titles, contents, and particularly the inspiration of the Scriptures. This will give necessary information to the catechumen, prepare him for the instruction of the catechism, and show the groundlessness of the objection, that there is little or no affinity between it and the Bible. If the true relation of the catechism to the Word of God is more carefully emphasized, there will be less objection to its use as "a Bible for the laity."

2. In the answer to question 163, some of the attributes ascribed to God in the Scriptures are omitted. Why not add eternity, omnipresence, invisibility, incomprehensibility, etc.? They are all involved in the subsequent instructions of the catechism.

3. A statement of the duties of church-members, either in amplification of the treatise on Confirmation, or in the Appendix. Our Formula of Government and Discipline is very limited on this topic, and as the design of catechisation is to prepare our youth for full church-membership, it seems to us that a liberal discussion of these duties in the catechism would be orderly and helpful.

It may be objected that these additions would enlarge the work to an undesirable size, but surely we cannot sacrifice the wants of the soul and the Church for the sake of brevity and convenience, nor should we cater to the foolish prejudices of men, when no pains of labor or expense are shared in the promotion of secular education. We should be as liberal as the world in preparing, publishing and using our religious textbooks.

We hail the advent of the "New Catechism" with joy. We

greet it with a hearty welcome, and bid it God-speed in its mission of light and love. We trust that it shall awaken a deeper interest in the time-honored custom of the indoctrination of our youth, and that it shall be used as a "manual of devotion" by the entire Church, even as the great Reformer has taught us by his own example.

B. F. ALLEMAN, Shippensburg, Pa.

[One of the gentlemen engaged to take part in this Symposiac, one whose judgment in such a matter is of great weight, was prevented by the pressure of pastoral duties and other ecclesiastical engagements from giving the subject the attention which it requires and wrote a few days before our going to press, as follows:—Ed.]

I am sorry that I cannot write as I hoped. Only ten services last week, and this week about ten or more solid hours to——

I commenced the work but as I could not do it thoroughly gave it up. I observed the Dr. does not deal with the truths of original sin and justification by faith. His exposition of the Second and Third articles of the Creed are very meagre and are no real commentary on the explanation of Luther.

Much of the work is done well, apt definition in concise language. —— ——

It was promised in the last issue of the QUARTERLY that at least *ten* pastors and professors would participate in this Symposiac. These ten were selected and their several contributions were expected up to the time when all which have arrived were placed in the printer's hands. At the last hour, therefore, one of the editors is compelled with much reluctance to take part in this discussion—not indeed as a substitute for three absentees, but to approximate more nearly the numerical promise made to our readers.

The proper subject now before the Church, let it be remembered, is not Dr. Conrad, in personal esteem for whom the writer yields to no one, nor indeed his catechism *per se*, with many of the tributes to which, as published in the *Observer* we readily agree. But the supreme issue that claims the attention of the Church, is whether this shall be *our* catechism; whether the General Synod shall at its next convention in June adopt

this as its own catechism, investing it with the authority of a Creed by authorizing its use as a text-book for the indoctrination of the young.

Without entering here upon the full scope of the essentials of a Lutheran Catechism (for this, the reader is referred to the excellent article of Dr. Ziegler who in the sphere of catechetics has no superior in our bounds) we will name just a few of these requisites in the three following self-evident propositions:

I. *It should be restricted to the elements of the faith, excluding what is essentially controversial or speculative.*

II. *Its teachings must be theologically and historically correct.*

III. *Its definitions must be adequate, unambiguous and expressed in simple language.*

Now with the catechism in hand, let the reader apply these propositions respectively to the answers which are put by the author into the mouths of the catechumens, and if he has had training in Lutheran theology and in clear thinking, he will probably reach the conclusion that the following, among others, do not bear the test.

The last clause of the Answer to Quest. 5 is disallowed by III. It is inadequate. The Sacraments are not merely assurances, they are *means*, of grace.

The Ans. to 10 is disallowed by II. and III. The primary agent in a covenant with God, is always God himself, and the principal action in a sacrament is the divine action. Men are the recipients rather than the sole agents in a sacramental rite. Here man is made to do all, God's part is ignored.

22 and 24 taken together are condemned by III. The former solemnly makes the laws of God binding on all men. The latter makes "the ceremonial laws" which in 18 are called "laws of God" "not binding on us." And 25 falls under the same judgment, while the failure to name what laws are "ceremonial" leaves the whole subject in the greatest confusion. 28 and 29 are rejected by I. And not only are they out of place here, but there is a third division which is more logical than either of those mentioned.

45 and 47 do not stand the test of III.

Does the name of God "include" "everything else that be-

longs to him"? And why speak in this connection of "his word and day" * * "his ministers and people" as "belonging to God" when the Scriptures say "the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof!" 49 and 51 fall under the sentence of both II. and III. They represent both confusion and inaccuracy. The former mentions "swearing" "in and by the name of God" as one of the forms of "taking God's name in vain." The latter recognizes swearing as a proper appeal to God. The latter half of 54 is condemned by both II. and III. "To appeal to God to secure his direct interposition" is not in itself conjuration. Every man calling on God for salvation prays for his "direct interposition in the accomplishment of superhuman ends." Besides, if the teaching were correct, how many catechumens understand such terms (III)?

70 falls short of III. Reading Scripture and other religious literature is a very appropriate employment for the Lord's Day.

71 falls below what is required in II. "Recreation and pleasure," if proper in kind and degree, are not profanations of God's day.

75 is not in accord with II. There is no warrant for saying that "the first day of the week" is observed "in honor of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit." Certainly the only proof text offered says nothing of the kind.

81 is not "expressed in simple language." The latter part of 87 violates II. If all were "to follow the example" of their pastors, it would be a bad day for some churches. Both Jesus (Matt. 23 : 3) and Paul (I. Cor. 11 : 1) gave advice in conflict with Dr. Conrad's.

156, stating that the Apostles' Creed is due in part to the fact that "the prevalence of errors required opposing statements of truth" is not in accord with II. 159 is not in accord with III, neither is 162. To define "Almighty" by "Omnipotence" is not a model of simplicity.

176 is in violation of both II. and III. It is not by "creation" that God "preserved to me my body with all its members." 177 states correctly that "He has preserved my life" "by his providence," although there confusion is again introduced by ascribing to God's providence the gift of "all that I possess."

What, here, belongs to "Creation" and what to "Providence?" 190 and 191 combined violate II. and III. If by our Lord's "suffering" we are to understand, in part, the "assuming the nature" of man, this did not occur "under Pontius Pilate."

195 is ruled out by I. and though Luther held this idea, his two catechisms as well as the Form of Concord (Chap. 9) show that he had no idea of introducing the discussion of this mystery in the instruction of the young.

206 is disallowed under III.

209 is not in harmony with either I. or II. That the Son is "begotten of the Father" and that there is an order of *origin*, corresponding in the case of the Son with the "Procession" of the Holy Ghost has been the faith of Christendom for 1600 years. This does not make him "inferior to the Father," hence it is very misleading to combine the two ideas in one question.

Question 210 is confusion confounded. Who ever heard of the "distinction between him as the Son of *Man* and the Father" being at all questioned or discussed since the Sabellian controversy? Dr. Conrad certainly would distinguish in thought between Son of God and Son of Man. This answer is a virtual denial of the personal distinctions within the Godhead.

211 does violence either to II. or to III. If it is meant that "Christ should be divine" "in order that through death he might be a propitiation," etc., as is attempted to be proven by citing the passage Heb. 2 : 9, then the necessity of our Lord's divinity is confounded with that of his humanity, and the proof passage really refers not to the divine pre-existence of the Son with the Father, but to the incarnation, and ought to have been used at 213. If the author meant to teach that the divinity was necessary to give his sufferings infinite value and to make them efficacious for "the sins of the whole world" why does he not say so in unmistakable language? This answer is one of a number that has been submitted to the ablest Professors at Gettysburg, who after studying the language for some minutes, say, in substance, "Well, if he means so and so, the statement may stand. *But* if his idea aims at presenting, etc., etc." Now if these Doctors are not sure of the author's

meaning, what can the average pastor do, and the poor children?

233 fails under II. and III. It ascribes "names, attributes and works" of God to the Holy Spirit but fails to mention "worship" as in the case of the Son, Quest. 207. Why this very serious omission? It is the first time we have seen such omission in an argument for the Spirit's divinity.

239 is excluded by I. So is 242. When Lutheran Doctors shall have finished their controversies on the "Communion of Saints" it will be time to propose it to the innocent youths that study the catechism. The distinction between the external organization and the totality of believers can and ought to be taught, but not in this style. 255 both Question and Answer fail to meet test III.

263 is condemned by II. As the proof passage correctly has it, "He that believeth * * *has* everlasting life." The answer says incorrectly that it will be given "after the resurrection." True, these are Luther's words, but in an "amplification" of his catechism and in connection with this proof passage we expect a modification, showing that the life in God begins here while the consummation is not reached till after the resurrection. 274 is not adequate. (III.) What are soldiers to do as they are on the eve of battle—or the occupants of crowded tenement houses? Paul enjoins men to "pray everywhere."

276 fails under test II. There is not a particle of evidence that Christ ever "conducted the worship of the synagogues." He taught in them but he never presided over these Jewish assemblies.

277 is likewise incorrect. The Lord's Prayer is *not* "the true source of all devotional forms and liturgical services in Christendom." The Psalms have contributed far more material to the Liturgies.

302 is not an "adequate" interpretation of the sixth petition, which does not ask to be saved from temptation but begs God not to "lead us into" it.

314, as in nearly all the other references to the import of the Sacraments, care seems to have been taken to avoid the precise expressions in which Lutheran Theology abounds, such as "confer," "convey," "communicate," &c.; instead of these always

something vague like "signify," "assure," "seal," etc. Hence violating test II. and reminding one of Crypto-Calvinism and the Heidelberg Catechism which make the nearest possible approach to the Lutheran doctrine without stating it explicitly and unequivocally.

316 does not harmonize with III. probably not with II.—it depends upon what is meant. Half of the pastors will not understand it and many will vow that this is *the ex opere operato* doctrine of Romanism which the Reformers renounced with horror. 315 says "without true faith" the use of the sacraments will "prove of *none effect.*" This says their "intrinsic *efficacy*" depends "not upon the faith of the recipients." Certainly in the important doctrine which is doubtless here in the author's mind precise terminology is accessible and most desirable.

323 is ruled out by proposition I. It is to be regretted that such expressive phraseology as "means through which grace is conferred" and the "Spirit operating through perceptible vehicles," is not employed where the Lutheran conception of the Sacraments is treated.

328 fails by its ambiguity (III.).

339 denies the validity of Lay-baptism. Hence it conflicts with II. Or if Dr. C. admits Lay-baptism when necessary, this answer does not meet requirement III.

The last clause of 351 is in violation of II. cf. 1 Cor. 10 : 16. Not the enjoyment of "communion with each other," but the fact that the cup is the communion of the blood of Christ and the bread the communion of the body, led to the designation of the Supper by "Communion."

352 is also lacking in distinct historic accuracy. "The *table* set for the distribution of the supper" received the name of *altar*, says Neander, "so early as the time of Tertullian."

356 does not meet the test of either I. or III.

In 363 and elsewhere prayer is spoken of as a mere spiritual exercise. This is not in keeping with II and III.

372, 375 and 391 are condemned by II. The ratification of baptismal vows by the confirmant is not the historic significance of confirmation.

376 cannot stand before II. If there is on earth any evidence that this is the origin of confirmation we should be extremely glad to get a sight of it.

379 cannot be harmonized with III. Is faith in the Lord Jesus Christ not embraced "in a true profession of religion?"

This is not offered as an exhaustive examination, but it will suffice to indicate the writer's conviction that this catechism, with all its merits, has not reached the superlative degree. If the reader has, as suggested to him, followed the writer with the catechism in hand, he most likely shares this conclusion. We are sorry to disagree to such an extent with so many pastors and professors who have published in the *Observer* strong endorsements of this work, but we are quite confident that the author himself will cheerfully accept most of the above corrections when his attention shall be called to them. A man of Dr. Conrad's candor and ardent church love is a good deal more anxious for the Church to have the best possible catechism than for himself personally to receive the praise of men.

E. J. Wolf, Gettysburg, Pa.

[The following was received just as the printer finished the preceding paper, the first paragraph of which indicated that it would close the series. Though this came late, we are glad it was not too late to appear with the rest.—Ed.]

It cannot be expected of an author of a text-book that he shall adopt all the criticisms and suggestions of those who teach. His chief aim should be to treat the subject in hand in the most accurate and comprehensive manner, and in a way suited to those for whom it is prepared.

These requirements are hard to meet in a catechism. On the one hand it must deal with all the profound doctrines of the Bible, and all the vexed questions of theology; and on the other hand, it must so treat these subjects as to be understood by the immature mind of the child. Hence great care is necessary in every detail of such a book.

There is much to admire in the work we have in hand. At first we wonder at the generally striking aptness of the scripture quotations. This led us to the commendable conclusion that

the questions and answers were taken directly from the Scripture. This is solid ground, and is the chief merit of the book.

Then there are only a few but pointed references, and these are quoted. Many references make a catechism appear formidable to a child. If they are quoted, they make the book bulky, and are not all committed, and if they are merely referred to they are not looked up. The child is satisfied with one plain, printed proof text.

But our task lies more in the line of suggestion and criticism, than of commendation. Our space being limited, we proceed at once to offer a few thoughts of suggestion wherein we think the book might be improved.

We would omit questions 10, 11, and 12 out of the introduction, and make them prefatory to part IV. where they properly belong. Questions 28 and 29 ought to be omitted. They are not relevant to the subject. Moreover they gender discussion where none is necessary. The division of the commandments is arbitrary, and we see far more reason for rejecting than accepting the Augustinian method. The first commandment, as we have it here, expresses two distinct thoughts. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me" forbids *subjective* idolatry. "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image" forbids *objective* idolatry. This of itself ought to decide the matter. But the ninth and tenth commandments, on the other hand, are expressive of only one thought—*covetousness*. The "neighbor's house" in the ninth would group as well with "wife" and "servants" in the tenth as these do with "ox" and "ass," and surely "house" is included in the last clause of the tenth, "nor *anything* that is thy neighbor's." We have often wondered why Luther followed the Augustinian division. It may have been a delicate question in his day. Besides, our author is not himself consistent with his division. He finds it necessary in answer to question 41 to speak of a "literal" and a "spiritual" idolatry. If however it should be decided best to analyze the first commandment in this way, then we would reverse the order, and place "spiritual" before "literal," and then reverse the order of questions 42 and 43. Idolatry is first "spiritual"—conceived in the heart—before it is "literal"—wrought out in the religious life.

We would answer question 160 differently. We would omit "God is love." Love is only *one* of God's attributes, standing in the same relation to his nature as "justice," "holiness," etc. We would also omit the indefinite article "a," as is done in the first edition. God is not so well defined by saying he is *a* spirit, one of the spirits, as by simplying saying he is a *spirit.* The word πνεῦμα in the original of the proof text, John 4 : 24, stands in the position of emphatic first in the sentence, and refers to the immaterial, spiritual nature of God. The meaning is, that God is spirit in the highest and truest sense, and nothing but spirit. We would answer, "God is spirit, a self-existent, infinite, and perfect being." (We find our rendering of this passage, John 4 : 24, in the marginal note of the new version).

Not all the attributes are named in answer to question 163. Omnipresence is notably omitted. No less to us is God's all-presence, than his all-power. We would add to the proof text of question 277, "After this *manner*, therefore, pray ye," Matt. 6 : 9. This, then, would justify the assertion made in the last part of the answer.

In the answer to question 334 we prefer the word "merciful" used in the first edition, as being more scriptural and intelligible than the word "spiritual" in the new edition. Both words might be omitted.

We do not understand the answer to question 353. The grammar is bad. The antecedent of "which" and "it" may be something understood, suggested by the question. But as the sentence stands it is bad. "Which" would have to refer to "bread and wine." It is not the "institution" that is administered, but the "bread and wine." Nor is the "institution" the "communion of the body and blood of Christ." It is the "administration" of the "bread and wine," together with the use of the words of institution, that becomes the "communion of the body and blood of Christ." But why add this last clause? The things which "*constitute*"—"establish," "compose," "make up," or "give formal expression" to the Lord's Supper, are plainly, "the bread and wine," and the "words of institution." The "Lord's Supper" *is* the "communion of the body and blood of

Christ." These terms are synonymous. Would not the question be better answered by saying, "Of bread and wine, and their proper administration by (or in) the use of the words of institution?"

This last clause answers the question more fully, already partially answered under 350, "What is the Lord's Supper?" Or we might introduce a new question, "How is the Lord's Supper regarded by the Lutheran Church?" Ans. "As the communion of the body and blood of Christ." And here we would let the subject rest. We would omit questions 355, 356 and 357—especially 357. It is contrary to the spirit of Lutheranism to attempt further definition. The tenets of our Christianity, and the interpretation of the same by our articles of confession, are satisfied with the above answer. It *is* the "communion of the body and blood of Christ," but *how*, or in *what manner*, it is un-Lutheran to declare; and an attempt at definition only genders controversy and causes misunderstanding. Any way, even if theologians are permitted to discuss such questions, they are out of place in a book intended for the instruction of the young.

This leads us to anticipate a thought in conclusion which will be in place here, viz: that there is too much space given to, and too much stress laid upon the *sacraments*, which are secondary, being *means of grace*, as compared with the space and stress given the doctrines of sin, repentance, faith, etc., which bear more directly upon salvation itself. We do think that the *conditions* of salvation might receive a larger share of the author's notice.

And yet, while the sacraments are given a prominent place in the book, we might agree to something in addition—if that something were confined to the legitimate discussion of *how* the sacraments become means of grace.

Luther had a very profound view of the sacraments, but when drawn out into a scientific statement, he found himself subject to misunderstanding. Hence his appeal always was, to the "*words of institution.*" Here, and here alone, was he safe. And only here can we do justice to the doctrine, and maintain that spirit of harmony so much desired amongst ourselves, and with all of God's people. We only add, that it seems strange that in

an "explanation of Luther's catechism," Luther's own definition of the Lord's Supper does not appear.

In answer to question 379, we have among the things embraced in a "true profession of religion," "truths to be believed." In answer to question 380, these "truths" are said to be "set forth in the Apostles' Creed, and the Augsburg Confession." Why not omit this whole quotation? The truths may indeed be set forth both in the Apostles' Creed, and in our Confession, and yet both are compilations of men, and neither, as a whole, was necessary to a "true profession of religion" in apostolic times.

Not so much objection can be urged against the words, "Apostles' Creed;" for we make the Apostles' Creed a part of our form of confirmation. But would our esteemed author call only that a "true profession of religion," which must receive the doctrines of the gospel as "set forth in the Augsburg Confession?" We think he does not mean this. Do not those make a "true profession" who believe in the "fundamental doctrines of the gospel" as set forth in the Westminster Confession?

Here again discussion is provoked where there is no need. The question might be asked, "To what statement of doctrine does the Lutheran Church hold?" Ans. "To that given in the Augsburg Confession."

Answer to question 385 might be much simpler. Why trouble the child's mind about "theoretic faith" about which it knows nothing. The child's faith is fimple saith. We would also here add a few questions additional, such as would rise out of the proof texts under question 385. Faith is a most important doctrine, and eminent in Lutheran theology.

But the space allotted us compels us to conclude this very brief and imperfect examination. We add a few thoughts in general.

Many of the answers might be simpler and shorter. The plan of the book might be much improved by a more systematic arrangement in the order of salvation—a need in all our catechisms. All that is said of any one topic ought to be brought together in one place. More prominence ought to be given to the *conditions of salvation.* Some subjects might be more fully

treated. Nothing is said of the division of the Church into "visible" and "invisible," "militant" and "triumphant." Only one question is asked concerning the resurrection of the body. As a catechism we would omit all after page 108. As a handbook for the parent and teacher it may be useful.

We feel that, having space only for a few criticisms, we have not done justice to the many good qualities of the book. We are thankful for it, and hope it may attain the highest perfection possible to human minds and hearts.

J. M. CROMER, Kansas City, Mo.

NOTE.—On p. 290, line 6, instead of "he is a *spirit*," read "he is *spirit*."

ARTICLE VIII.

NOTES ON THE "TE DEUM."

By REV. J. E. BUSHNELL, A. M., Roanoke, Va.

The *Te Deum Landamus*, used in our service of praise, is one of the richest and most precious hymns of the Church. Its authorship, however, can not be fully determined. Some attribute it to Ambrose, of Milan, though he most likely translated and revised this poetic treasure, gathering the original from an older Greek source. Some call the *Te Deum*, *Hymnus* SS. Ambrosii et Augustini. It certainly introduces us to the Ambrosian period of church history, by reason of its recognized use, marking the musical and liturgical revival of this era. Cotemporaneous writers left a number of hymns remarkable for beauty, richness and scriptural devotion, with no lack of popular power and simplicity of style.

Ambrose introduced a musical reform and encouraged congregational singing. Before this the singing was performed by choirs to which the congregation gave only short responses, and the song service consisted of a monotonous, unregulated and artless recitation of the appointed psalms and prayers.

It is helpful and interesting to make a brief mention of the man, under whose influence the new impulse was given to congregational music, wherein the saving and evangelical truths of

God's Word were brought out by simple and popular songs for public instruction in the Gospel, with proper churchly regard to confession and prayer in the praise service. Ambrose, generally known as the good Bishop of Milan, belonged to a rich Roman family and was educated for the forum. While serving as the commissioned governor of Milan, a fierce contest, between contending church factions, arose concerning the election of a bishop. The Governor went to the church to maintain order and was addressing the crowd, when a child cried out—*Ambrosius Episcopus!* The multitude took this voice of a child for the voice of God and Ambrose left the judicial bench to occupy the episcopal chair so unexpectedly set before him. He was immediately baptized, and eight days after, Dec. 7th, 374, was consecrated Bishop of Milan; and like Zacchæus, when called by the Lord, he bequeathed his wealth to the poor and became rich in loving service. He discharged his duties with truly apostolic zeal, and proved a father to the poor, a protector of the oppressed, an untiring pastor and an able defender against both heresy and heathenism. The eloquence which he had formerly displayed in the forum became more brilliant when employed in the service of Christ. * * To affability and gentleness he joined a firmness which neither the fear of men, nor threats and dangers could shake. (*Kurtz's Ch. Hist.*) Truly such a one could say, "For mine own part, I wish so to order my conversation in the world, that I may live when I am dead—in the affections of the best; and leave an honorable testimony in the consciences of the worst; that I may oppress none and do good to all; that I may neither be ashamed to live, nor afraid to die."

When we consider the consecrated life of Ambrose, it is no wonder that God should put a new song in his mouth. Most likely the *Te Deum*, handed down from the early Church, grew in beauty and richness in such a spiritual atmosphere, as did the *Gloria in Excelsis* under the touch of holy hands.

Having been used in its present form for fourteen centuries and treasured by the universal Church to this day, we can not over-estimate the fellowship of that great company which has been strengthened and comforted in its use. In these modern

times, when hymns that barely touch the Master's outer garment are in the popular favor, we do well to remember that no gospel songs of this century surpass the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the *Gloria Patri* and the *Te Deum Laudamus*, for scriptural simplicity, spiritual power and gospel instruction. The *Te Deum* lays the believer's head upon the Master's bosom, while the grateful soul breathes the very spirit of heaven.

The three-fold division:

(1) The first nine verses, ending with "The noble army of the martyrs praise thee," constitute a *Hymn of Praise to God.* In this service of thanksgiving, the *Te Deum* brings together earth and heaven, with all the powers therein; for angels, apostles, prophets and martyrs become a great cloud of witnesses about us while we worship the Lord of Hosts.

(2) The following ten verses constitute a Confession of Faith, after the teaching of the Apostles' Creed. Here we confess our faith in the Holy Trinity—Father, Son and Spirit, and also our faith in the human birth and sacrificial death of Christ, who humbled himself to be born of a virgin. Again we acknowledge Christ's mediatorial reign and look for his glorious return to be our Saviour and Judge. What gospel hymn of modern times is more rich in saving truth than these precious lines?

(3) At the beginning of the third part it is the recognized usage in some churches to kneel, since the closing ten verses are a *Solemn Prayer.* Here all say, or sing: "We therefore pray thee, help thy servants, whom thou hast redeemed with thy precious blood."

This is manifestly the worship of Christ, as is taught in the words, "And we worship thy name ever world without end." The prayer is in the very language of scripture and is in the spirit of the Publican, whose simple appeal touched the Master's heart, rather than the more self-complacent language of the Pharisee. As in the *Kyrie*, so here we pray: "O Lord, have mercy upon us, have mercy upon us." The most ignorant and the sinner who is too conscience stricken to look up, may utter this prayer. In his evil hour, when God's anger was poured out, David could say, "Have mercy upon me, O God;" and so the Church would teach all to pray.

A careful and earnest study of the *Te Deum*, as a beautiful hymn, a scriptural confession of faith in Christ, and a simple prayer, shows us that our fathers and mothers, in the church of the 4th century, found their guidance in the clear and heavenly teaching of God's revealed truth, rather than in the uncertain conditions of personal and subjective experiences. Man's heart, at best, is deceitful, but God's word is fixed forever in the life and love of incarnate truth, set before us in the holy gospels. The hymns of the early Christians were written upon an open Bible and were sung in the spirit of scriptural worship; and not for mere musical effect, nor to fill up the time between speakers and keep the crowd busy, as is so commonly observed in modern gospel meetings.

The major and minor doxologies—the *Gloria in Excelsis* and *Gloria Patri*, with the *Te Deum*, the *Litany* and like treasures, are the gold of the Gospel seven times refined. The language, where it seems heavy with age, is often the very expression of holy writ, as contrasted with more modern thought. We open our Bibles and find almost the same words, and always the same teaching. Thus it is that these old hymns run their course and seem to lose light and power in the border-land of western glory; but to every new born soul, the Sun of Righteousness rises ever new with the return of each successive day-dawn.

Hence we treasure the old hymns of the Church, so full of Christ and his saving grace. Hence we give place to the *Te Deum Landamus* at each glad season of National Thanksgiving and whenever its use is helpful.

May God tune our hearts while we sing praise to him whose redeeming love hath exalted us to the power and influence of a great people in this Christian land. With the Church of our Fathers, let us sing:

"We praise the, O God."

ARTICLE IX.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

ENGLISH.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.—*Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians*, by F. Godet, translated from the French by Rev. A. Cusin, M. A. *System of Christian Certainty*, by Dr. Fr. H. R. Frank, translated from the German by Rev. Maurice J. Evans. *The Self-Revelation of God*, by Samuel Harris, D. D. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, by John Hutchinson, D. D. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. VIII, by Rev. A Roberts, D. D., and Jas. Donaldson, LL. D. (edition by The Christian Literature Co.) *Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, by Philip Schaff, from same Co. *Statements Theological and Critical*, by Daniel D. Whedon, D. D., LL. D. *Essays, Reviews and Discourses*, by Daniel D. Whedon, D. D., LL. D. *An American Commentary on the New Testament*, by Alvah Hovey, D. D., LL. D. *Christ in the Heart*, and other Sermons, by Alex. Maclaren, D. D. *Current Discussions in Theology*, by the Professors of Chicago Theological Seminary, Vol. IV. *The Throne of Grace*, a Call to Prayer, by M. Rhodes, D. D. *The People's Bible*, Discourses upon Holy Scripture, by Jos. Parker, D. D., Vol. V. *Commentary on the Psalms*, by Prof. Delitzsch, (the Foreign Biblical Library, edited by Rev. W. R. Nicoll). *Daniel I.–VI.*, an Exposition, by the Very Rev. R. Payne Smith, D. D., Dean of Canterbury. *Theology of Evolution*, a Lecture, by E. D. Cope, A. M., Ph. D.

SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL.—*The Realistic Assumptions of Modern Science Examined*, by Thos. M. Herbert, M. A. *Some Problems of Philosophy*, by Archibald Alexander. *Creation or Evolution*, by George Ticknor Curtis. *The Geographical and Geological Distribution of Animals*, by Angelo Heilprin. *Common Sense Science*, by Grant Allen. *Introduction to Psychological Theory*, by Borden P. Bowne. *The Conception of the Infinite*, a Study in Psychological Analysis, by George S. Fullerton, A. M., B. D. *Realistic Philosophy*, by Jas. McCosh, D. D., LL. D., Vol. I. Expository, Vol. II. Historical and Critical. *Descartes and His School*, by Kuno Fisher, translated by J. P. Gordy, Ph. D., Edited by Noah Porter, D. D., LL. D. *Psychology*, by John Dewey, Ph. D., Assistant Professor of Philosophy in Michigan University. *Moral Philosophy*, a Series of Lectures, by Andrew P. Peabody, D. D., LL. D.

HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL.—*Life of Thomas Hart Benton*, by Theodore Rosefelt. *A History of the Papacy during the Period of the*

Reformation, by M. Creighton, M. A., Vols. III. and IV. *A History of Modern Europe*, by C. A. Tyffe, M A., Vol. II.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*The Rise and Early Constitution of Universities*, with a Survey of Mediæval Education, by S. S. Laurie, LL. D. *What shall we do with the Sunday School as an Institution*, by Geo. Lansing Taylor, D. D. *Letters from Heaven*, translated from the 4th German edition. *The Mormon Puzzle and How to Solve it*, by Rev. R. W. Beers, A. M. *Social Studies*, by R. Heber Newton. *Masters of the Situation*, Secrets of Power and Success, by W. J. Tilley, D. D. *Outlines of International Law*, by Geo. B. Davis, U. S. A.

GERMAN.

THEOLOGICAL.—*Die Lehre vom Gebet* nach dem Neuen Testament. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntniss und Würdigung des ursprünglichen Christenthums. Paul Christ. pp. 98. Leiden. *Chrisliche Eschatologie.* Th. Kliefoth. pp. 351. Leipsic. *Das Selbstbewustsein Jesu.* R. F. Grau. pp. 393. Nördlingen. Van Oosterzee's *Theologie des Neuen* Testaments. 2d enlarged Edition. pp. 279. *Der Gottesbegriff in der Gegenwart und Zukunft.* Ein Versuch Zur Verständigung. M. R. v. Stern. pp. 128. Zurich. *Die christlichen Centralideen des Reiches Gottes und Erlösung.* Mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Nichttheologen dargestellt. Dr. Hugo Raehse. pp. 48. Halle. *Die Zehn Geboten Gottes in Predigten.* Dr. Emil Frommel (Hof-pred.) 5. verb. Auflage. pp. 213. Barmen.

BIBLICAL.—*Bilder aus dem Leben des Apostels Paulus.* Nachgezeichnet. Rud. Ehlers. pp. 255. Frankfort a. M. In Strack and Zöckler's "*Kurzgefasster Kommentar*" des Neuen Testaments the second volume contains Das Evangelium nach Johannes and Die Apostelgeschichte, erläutert von Proff. DD. Ernst Chr. Luthardt und Otto Zöckler. pp. 284. Nördlingen. *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Neue Testament.* Dr. Bernh. Weiss. pp. 652. Berlin. *Biblische Chronologie und Zeitrechnung der Hebräer.* E. Mahler. pp. 204. Vienna. *Die Bedeutung des Alten Testaments für die christliche Predigt.* Past. Lic. Ernst Bindemann. pp. 346. Gütersloh. Cremer's *Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch der neutestamentlichen Grecität.* 5. Aufl. I. Drittel. pp. 304. Gotha. Holtzmann's *Lehrbuch der Historisch-kritischen Einleitung* in das Neue Testament. 2d improved and enlarged edition. pp. 560. Freiburg i. Br.

HISTORICAL.—*Die Religionen der Völker.* Nach den besten Forschungs-Ergebnissen bearb. 3. Buch. A. Reichenbach. pp. 243–358. Munich. *Verfassung, Cultus und Disciplin der christlichen Kirche* nach den Schriften Tertullians. Dr. Jos. Priest. Hohlberg. pp. 226. Braunsberg. *Die Unionspolitik Landgraf Philipps* des grossmüthigen von Hessen und die Unterstützung der Hugenotten im ersten Religions-Krieg. Dr. Arth. Heidenhain. pp. 122. Breslau. Vol. III. of Ritchl's

Geschichte des Pietismus. Der Pietismus in der luther. Kirche d. 17 u. 18. Jahrh. 2. Abth. pp. 469. Bonn. Vol. II. of Witte's *Leben Dr. F. A. G. Tholuck's*, 1826–1877. pp. 563. Bielefeld. *Spanische Glaubenshelden.* Reformations-bilder. E. Christ. pp. 312. Basel. *Die Naturvölker.* Missverständnisse, Missdeutungen und Misshandlungen. 2. Tle. Dr. Wilh. Schneider. pp. 310, 501. Paderborn.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*Beitrage Zur Geographie Palestinas.* Doc. Dr. Hildesheimer. pp. 93. Berlin. *Die weibliche Diakonie* in ihrem ganzen Umfang dargestellt. Th. Schäfer. 2. Aufl. I. Bd. Die Geschichte der weiblichen Diakonie. pp. 328. Stuttgart. *Die Macht des Gebets* mit besonderer Beziehung auf *Krankenheilung.* L. Lemme. pp. 118. Barmen. *Die Sittenlehre des Darwinismus.* Eine Kritik der Ethik Herbert Spencers. Vict. Cathrein. S. J. pp. 146. Freiburg i. Br. *Der Verkehr des Christen mit Gott*, im Anschluss an Luther dargestellt. Prof. Dr. W. Herrman. pp. 205. Stuttgart. *Die Wendung zur Wahrheit in der Modernen Kulterentwickelung.* A. Bärthold. pp. 80. Gütersloh. *Ein Ritt in das gelobte Land.* Land und Leute in Palestina vor 3000 Jahren. A. Thoma. pp. 155. Berlin. *Einwärts, Aufwärts, Vorwärts!* Pilgergedanken und Lebenserfahrungen. Dr. Max Frommel. pp. 227. Bremen.

ARTICLE X.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

A. C. ARMSTRONG & SON, NEW YORK.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia.

The Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuchal Codes. By Geerhardus Vos, Fellow of Princeton Theological Seminary. With an Introduction by Professor William Henry Green. 1886. pp. 270.

This treatise, we are told in Dr. Green's Introduction, was prepared as a thesis in competition for the Hebrew Fellowship in the Princeton Seminary. The Fellowship being awarded to him, he is now pursuing his studies at the University of Berlin. The high merits of the treatise undoubtedly justify its appearance in this neat volume. The subject discussed is the Mosaic origin of the laws of the Pentateuch, a subject which the destructive critics of the Graf, Kuenen and Wellhausen school have brought into great prominence and importance. Mr. Vos has presented the essential points in debate with remarkable clearness. His treatment shows a thorough acquaintance with the whole literature of the subject, and unusual skill in using it for the maintenance of the Mosaic authority of the Pentateuchal codes. But we cannot give the character and merits of the book better than by quoting from Dr. Green's introductory statement:

"It will be found that the discussion in this little volume is neither narrow nor superficial. It is not a summary of results hastily gathered from compendiums at second hand, but it is drawn from the direct study of original sources. The views of the leading critics are concisely stated on the various points raised in the controversy, substantially as they present them themselves. These are uniformly treated with eminent candor and fairness, while at the same time their weakness and fallacy are skilfully exposed. The book makes no pretensions to be an exhaustive exhibition of the subject. It will not, of course, prove a substitute for more elaborate and extended works; though, to those who are entering upon the study, it will be an admirable introduction to them. And for such as wish to gain a general knowledge of the present state of critical questions concerning the Pentateuch, the range of the discussion, and the arguments employed on each side, I do not know where a more satisfactory exhibition can be found, of what intelligent readers would wish to learn, in so small a compass." M. V.

Representative English Prose and Prose Writers. By Theodore W. Hunt, Ph. D., Professor of Rhetoric and English Language in the College of New Jersey, Author of "The Principles of Written Discourse," etc. pp. xiii, 527.

This is a thoroughly good book and worthy of a more extended notice than can here be given it. It is divided into three parts: I. Representative Historic Periods, in which the *disjecta membra* of treatises on English literature are joined together and appear as a living and growing body; II. Representative Literary Forms, treating of the different kinds of prose as historical, philosophical, oratorical, &c.; III. Representative Prose Writers, where the styles of Bacon, Milton, Addison, Macaulay, Carlyle and others are carefully analyzed and estimated. The whole work has a practical value and, while giving a more satisfactory view of English literature than most so-called Histories of the subject, may serve students as an advanced work on rhetoric. The style is clear, temperate and well suited for didactic purposes. There is none of that affected brilliancy which is so often associated with indifference to truth and moral recklessness. The reader feels that the author has supreme regard for truth and good morals and that he is a safe guide. As a critic he is humane and sympathetic, and evidently takes more pleasure in giving a favorable than an unfavorable judgment.

Teachers of English literature and pupils too may take satisfaction in the marked tendency towards a more systematic presentation of the subject. Of this tendency the volume before us is one of the best illustrations.

The City Youth. By J. Thain Davidson, D. D , Author of "Talks with Young Men," "Forwarned—Forearmed," etc. pp. 291. 1887.

Dr. Davidson has shown by his previous volumes addressed to the

young that he possesses uncommon gifts to reach the attention and hold the interest of this element in society. The present work is a collection of twenty sermons chiefly intended for lads of from sixteen to twenty years of age, who have left the parental roof, and have gone up to push their way in the busy crowded city.

The author has a deep and broad insight into the heart of youth, he knows how to lay bare the hidden springs of human action and character, and to paint worldliness and selfishness with the hideous tints that belong to them; and best of all he shows the sympathy of a Christian man with the weak, the tempted and the imperiled.

The style is simple, animated and forceful, solid and wholesome counsel being enlivened by illustration and story which make the book as attractive as it is earnest, evangelical and helpful. It is one of those books that ought to go into every family and Sunday-school library.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia.

The Self-Revelation of God. By Samuel Harris, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Yale University. pp. 570. 1887.

In this volume we are favored with a work which belongs to the higher order of theological productions. Both the subject and its treatment put it among the notable works of the day. The subject is the most important one involved in the speculative thought of our age. The treatment is able, earnest, candid and thorough, under the light of the latest scientific and philosophical research.

It is not intended as specifically a treatise on natural theology, nor distinctively as an exhibit of the Christian evidences. It seeks rather to unite what is fundamental in both. The place it is meant to occupy is between that of the purely metaphysical grounds of theological truth as treated in the author's work, *The Philosophical Basis of Theism*, and that usually covered by special treatises on "the Evidences of Christianity." It is intended as an exposition of the generic features of the whole self-revelation of God in both nature and redemption. Its high aim is not only to show such self-revelation to be reasonable, but to make the fact of it clear and certain, by an exhibition of its necessary and actual characteristics, in its whole range and all its modes, whether called natural or supernatural.

In Part I. Dr. Harris considers the origin and nature of the knowledge of God. It is shown to rise as a spontaneous belief developed in man's experience. This, however, is not primarily man's finding God, but God's coming to man in self-disclosure through such given experiences. The fundamental principle is that revelation is always and necessarily from the divine side, from some divine action or influence by which God makes himself known to man. Creation, in all its parts and movements,

is divine self-manifestation. Through their experience He becomes an object of knowledge to men, because he, in his action, is an implicit reality in all that is known. What God reveals is himself, rather than any doctrines about himself. Man, by being intelligent, rational, a true personality, is receptive of the self-reveleation of God, as he is receptive of the knowledge of an objective world about him.

Whether or not the spontaneous idea of God arising from experience, is supported by sufficient further self-disclosures through nature and history, to stand as verified, as well as enlarged, in rational thought, is made the point of inquiry throughout the rest of the volume. The author shows how God has made a revelation of himself in the universe, both in nature and in man, and peculiarly in Christ. In doing this he points out how the existence of an absolute or unconditioned Being is manifested in the universe, as well as required as a first principle of reason and a necessary law of thought. In the cosmological argument this absolute Being is shown to be the First Cause, transcending the universe. In the physico-theological, or design argument, the evidence becomes overwhelming that the absolute Being is a rational Power, a purposing Intelligence, the personal God. This conclusion is enforced by the self-revelation of God traced in the constitution and history of man.

The rest of the volume carries forward the evidence of this self-revelation of God in Christ as the Redeemer of man from sin. The essential characteristics of this are traced, together with the relations of this supernatural disclosure to the system and operation of nature. The whole discussion, traversing a vast field of thought and employing the latest and best results of science and philosophy, forms a most impressive presentation and defense of the foundations of Christian truth.

In a work of such wide range, involving so many and such difficult questions, it is not to be expected that an author's views should command assent as to every particular. We are not able to agree with all the views Dr. Harris presents. It is hardly sure that he does not give the evolution philosophy too thorough a shaping power in his conception of nature, in harmony with which he adjusts the scheme of revelation. It seems to us, too, that in his recoil from the old extreme severance between Natural and Revealed Theology, he is seeking unduly to blot out the real distinction between them. Specially untenable, psychologically and philosophically, we believe to be his assertion that men have an "immediate consciousness of God." Considerable effort is made to establish this form of statement. The author seems to suppose that he proves its correctness when he shows that "we know God in experience," using the two forms of expression as equivalent. This can be done only by giving the term "immediate consciousness" an extension beyond the limits of psychological truth, and making it simply an expression for our whole psychical action, the sum of all our cogni-

tive powers. This is to drop the specific meaning of "consciousness" or "immediate consciousness." No objection can be made against the explanation of the term, which holds that in an act of sense perception, consciousness includes the three elements of content, the psychical act or state, the ego acting, and the external object. When, however, Dr. Harris claims, as a parallel with such immediate consciousness of *material* non-egoistic objects, that there is an immediate consciousness of God, he claims what is not shown. The very effort to show it shows the contrary. For the mode indicated is through the rational "intuition" of certain realities, from which the mind necessarily forms the concept of God. He mentions these elements—"absolute being," and "spirit." We have an intuition of "spirit" in knowing ourselves. "Absolute being" is known "as a necessary truth in rational intuition." Dr. Harris admits that "the components of the idea" appear primarily in the consciousness only as undiscriminated elements. But when we have the two factors of the idea, "absolute being" and "spirit," "we combine the two in one idea of God, the absolute Spirit." "The idea may be formed from them in thought." "The idea is legitimately formed, for the components of it are known in intuition." Thus the very explanation given shows that instead of our knowledge of God being by an "*immediate consciousness*," the idea is "formed" only through and at the end of a process of analysis and synthesis. Happily, while this explanation annuls the claim that this knowledge is by "immediate consciousness," it does not affect its validity or strength. We see no necessity for invoking such an untenable claim, when the argument or evidence is as good or better without it.

M. V.

Some Problems of Philosophy. Archibald Alexander, Professor of Philosophy in Columbia College. pp. 170. 1886.

This is both an interesting and a disappointing book. Interesting because of the importance and variety of the problems presented, and because of the freshness and suggestiveness of some of the discussions. Disappointing, because the analyses are often conducted through ambiguous forms of statement and end without bringing the difficulties into distinct and definite view. A work of this sort, proposing, not a solution of the difficulties of philosophy, but an exposition of them, must have its highest value in the clearness with which it does this, brushing away ambiguities and resolving the difficulties into their precise point, relations and amount. Such a clear statement does most effective philosophical service, preparing the way for satisfactory solution of the problems, if solution be possible, or exhibiting the irreducible elements, if insoluble. To present a problem in its last analysis is often the next thing to a full explanation. The author has made excessive, and sometimes misleading use of the disjunctive method. The alternatives presented are not always the only possible ones, though treated as such.

For illustration of these faults take, for instance, the tenth chapter, on The Immortality of the Soul. Almost at the start a degree of indefiniteness is introduced in the words "unknown" and "proven," both having a variable sense. After the statement that if the knowledge is by inference, and "the inference must be from known or unknown premises," the author excludes the first alternative by declaring that "if the premises are known they must be *post mortem* premises." This arbitrarily assumes that there are no facts, spiritual or any other, in man's present life, from which a legitimate inference may be drawn on the subject. And the chapter ends with the conclusion: "The problem of immortality lies therefore outside of the circle of theoretical philosophy"—a statement which, if "theoretical philosophy" means what it has always been accepted as meaning, is authorized neither by the facts in the case nor the author's own reasoning. His conclusion in the problem of The Infinite, p. 117, is determined by a confounding of a 'knowledge of the infinite' with 'infinite knowledge.'" M. V.

S. C. GRIGGS & CO., CHICAGO.

Masters of the Situation, or Some Secrets of Success and Power. By William James Tilley, B. D. pp. 338.

If, as the author quaintly illustrates in the preface, the question as to whether a man has a call to write is dependent upon whether others have a call to read, then Mr. Tilley has received, in no uncertain tones, a call for just such a volume as he has prepared. Its intensely practical nature is at once evident on glancing at the table of topics discussed. Among these are Promptness, Individuality, Application, Habit, Manners, Genius, &c.

These subjects are old, and upon them much has been written, so that at first one might feel inclined to imagine that this volume contains only what has already been presented scores of times. But the error of such first impression will become apparent on reading but a few pages. While, of course, the truths of the important subjects discussed are always the same, the treatment of them in this work is carried forward in an exceedingly fresh and attractive manner. Instead of the abstract, the concrete form is employed, and for this purpose the history of politics, literature, art and science has been ransacked and made to contribute.

We cannot too highly recommend this volume, especially as a work for young men. It is quickening and stimulating in its effects, healthful in tone, and cannot but be serviceable in bringing about a higher, more earnest type of Christian manhood. M. V.

AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew. By John A. Broadus, D. D., LL. D. pp. 610.

The title on the back of this book runs "AN AMERICAN COMMENTARY

ON THE NEW TESTAMENT." The internal make-up has in this title a fair indication and this is one of its greatest merits. It is throughout practical, and withal lucid and intelligible to any ordinary capacity. Laymen who are readers, and Sunday-school teachers who are fit for their position, as well as pastors will be sure by the use of this work to gain as a rule a clearer and fuller vision of the truth which is conveyed in the language of the Evangelist.

The great German Commentaries appear to be written mostly for the benefit of eminent Biblical scholars. They are largely made up of critical controversies on points which perplex advanced students, and as they handle these vexed questions, which are of no practical import, the professors and other learned men generally speak of them in very complimentary terms and this is enough to make them popular. Very few of course will admit that they do not understand them, and fortunately no official examination is ever made on this point.

This work is none the less learned because it possesses an American character and is adapted to the wants of American students of the Bible. The author's name is a guarantee for that. He has had many years of experience as Professor of the Interpretation of the New Testament. Every page of the commentary reveals his familiarity with the Greek tongue of the original and his thorough mastery of this Gospel combined with a rare exegetical faculty. The result before us is in fact the best warrant for his statement that twenty years of labor have been bestowed upon the preparation of the work. This is a nobler testimony not only to the Bible but to the man himself, than the claim made for certain "Notes" on the New Testament some years ago that "they were prepared before breakfast." Dr. Broadus had even the advantage of traversing the Holy Land and thereby making his eyes familiar with the sacred scenes that have so important a bearing upon the interpretation of many historical passages.

The commentary is based on the Common English Version, but the Revised Version in its *American* form is given in parallel columns with the other, the marginal renderings of the Common and the Revised Versions are usually noticed, and the early English translations are mentioned when likely to profit the general reader.

Of course on points where the Baptists divide from the other Christian bodies the Baptist position is frankly and earnestly maintained, but this is a much lesser evil than the specious rationalism which insinuates itself into almost every one of the great Bible Commentaries of Europe. The "Homiletical and Practical" supplement to each division is judicious and valuable, the author having eminent homiletical talent. An able general Introduction to the New Testament by Dr. Hovey, the general editor of the series, is prefixed. It is in nearly all its features a work worthy of a place among the best expositions of this gospel.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK AND LONDON.

The Pocket Atlas of the World. A comprehensive and popular series of Maps Illustrating Physical and Political Geography. By John Bartholomew, F. R. G. S. With Geographical Notes. 1887.

It is no small satisfaction to be able to carry the world in one's pocket. With this little volume one may have that pleasure. It contains 54 different maps and is just what a traveler or a student at home wants to have with him all the time. Those maps giving the environs of large cities like New York, London, Liverpool, Edinburgh, Glasgow, &c., will prove especially serviceable. Then there are statistical tables summarizing the leading facts of General Geography, Population, Commerce, Routes of Travel, &c., &c., with a very interesting list of important words or syllables often occurring in the composition of geographical names, giving their etymological import. The little work is gotten up very neatly and substantially. It is a gem of *multum in parvo.*

Chivalric Days, and the Boys and Girls who helped to make them. By E. S. Brooks, author of "Historic Boys." Illustrated. pp. 308. 1887.

Mr. Brooks is becoming one of the most popular and successful writers for girls and boys. His "Historic boys" was widely recognized as one of the best works of its kind, and his contributions to *St. Nicholas* are among the most valuable features of that splendid journal. "Chivalric Days" tells the story of certain notable scenes and occasions in the world's history, ranging from the days of the Pharaohs to those of the American Revolution, tales full of absorbing interest and told in a strain well calculated to kindle in the young the noble virtues of chivalric days. For the author keeps the attention riveted not only on the quaint customs and costumes, the manners and the home-life, but also on the simple and homely morals of those far-off days. The work, which comprises stories of the girls as well as the boys of the past, is issued in uniform style with "Historic Days." It is profusely illustrated and elegantly printed and bound.

The Story of the Saracens, from the Earliest Times to the Fall of Bagdad. By Arthur Gilman, M. A., author of "The Story of Rome," etc. pp. xvii, 493.

The Story of Carthage. By Alfred J. Church, M. A., Professor of Latin in University College, London, with the collaboration of Arthur Gilman, M. A. pp. xx, 309.

Here are two more volumes of the "Story of the Nations" series. We have had occasion to notice previous ones, and we find that all the merits of those belong to these. We commend the enterprise of the publishers in undertaking the series, and for the excellent and attractive form in which the books appear. Paper, printing, binding, all are good. The editor, too, deserves praise for the excellence of his work.

Each book has a map, and illustrations appear here and there throughout its pages. They are books specially for the young student but older ones, too, will find them readable and profitable.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

The Throne of Grace, or A Call to Prayer. By M. Rhodes, D. D., Author of "Expository Lectures on Philippians," "Life Thoughts for Young Men," "Life Thoughts for Young Women," "Recognition in Heaven," "Vital Questions pertaining to Christian Belief," etc., etc. pp. 250.

All the books that Dr. Rhodes has written are characterized by a devout spirit, striking thoughts happily expressed, and lessons that ought to prove exceedingly helpful to the reader. His intense earnestness glows on every page. His last, entitled "The Throne of Grace," is like the rest in their best features. It embraces fourteen chapters on Prayer which were delivered as a series of lectures before his congregation. Among the subjects are, "God the Hearer of Prayer," "The Nature of Prayer," "Conditions of Effectual Prayer," "Intercessory Prayer," "What Shall We Pray For?" "Secret Prayer," "The Church and Prayer." The book is sent out on its mission of good, and we trust that mission will be a wide and useful one. It is well adapted to do an inestimable service in promoting Christian life and duty.

FLEMING H. REVELL, 148–150 MADISON ST., CHICAGO.

Current Discussions in Theology. By the Professors of Chicago Theological Seminary. Vol. IV. pp. 336.

This is an annual report on the conspicuous phases of theological thought throughout the world. Each professor reaps in his own special field and here are the garnered sheaves of all. It is an excellent plan, and it would be well if the faculties of other seminaries would do the same. With different bases of selection, the gleanings would be different, and we should thus have fuller and more varied results.

The *first* part here is "Exegetical Theology," with subdivisions "Old Testament" and "New Testament;" *second*, "Historical Theology" embracing recent studies in the history of the Early Church, Church of the Middle Ages, Modern Church; *third* part, "Systematic Theology," covering Dogmatics, Apologetics, Theism and Ethics; *fourth* part, "Practical Theology," with subdivisions "Homiletics" and "Pastoral Theology." Short reviews are given of many of the principal books that have appeared, which will be helpful to the reader for further investigation. The year covered by this volume ends with June, 1886.

G. W. FREDERICK, PHILADELPHIA.

The Evangelical Pastor. By Rev. Edward T. Horn, A. M., Pastor of St. John's, Charleston, S. C. pp. 256.

The Questions and Answers which form the bulk of this book are

founded on Dr. Walther's *Amerikanisch-Lutherische Pastoraltheologie*, made up mainly of the decisions of the Fathers of the Reformation on matters likely to perplex the judgment and the conscience of every pastor. They have the flavor of the 16th century, but old wine like this will be a good tonic to many whose pastoral life has been enfeebled by too free a use of the patent *nostrums* which are so popular in our American ecclesiasticism. We should have preferred an original work from the clever young author, and no doubt the substance would have been essentially the same, but he preferred to have those views on practical theology come out with the weight of authority attaching to such names as Luther, Bugenhagen, Chemnitz and Spener. No work is more needed by our English Lutheran pastors than one of this character, and while neither personally endorsing every position taken in this little volume, nor expecting the adoption of all its suggestions by our pastors, we believe that its general circulation will exert a powerful influence in developing a ministerial conscience and moving pastors everywhere to do things in the house of God "decently and in order."

T. H. DIEHL, ALLENTOWN.

Biblical History, Comprising Old and New Testament, explained by Catechism, Parallel Bible Verses and Hymn Stanzas, and Illustrated with 125 Engravings and Maps. Old Testament, pp. 150. The New Testament, 138.

This "Bible History" first appeared in German some years ago and met with such favor that a number of editions were called for. It is now published in this English form and is destined to have a wide use in Sunday-schools and families. Greater familiarity with the Scriptures is one of the most pressing needs of the age and we know of no better work for learning the historical part by children than the volume before us, using as it does the words of the Bible itself, giving a continuous history, and abounding in capital illustrations.

PAMPHLETS.

Evolution, as Taught in the Bible. By Rev. G. C. H. Hasskarl. Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia, Pa.

Colleges North and Colleges South An address by Dr. Julius D. Dreher, President of Roanoke College, before the department of Higher Instruction of the National Educational Association, at Topeka, Kansas, July 16, 1886. Salem, Mass., Observer Book and Job Print.

An Easter Service for Sunday Schools. Crowning the Cross by Rev. M. F. Troxell, Kansas City, Mo.

Fifty Years in the Pastoral Relation. A sermon preached by Rev. N. Van Alstine at Raymerton, N. Y., Oct. 10, 1886. Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia.

Twentieth Anniversary Sermon. Preached by Rev. William Hull before St. John's Evangelical Lutheran Church, Hudson, N. Y. F. H. Webb, Printer, Hudson, N. Y.

THE

QUARTERLY REVIEW

OF

THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

JULY, 1887.

ARTICLE I.

LUTHER BEFORE THE DIET OF WORMS.

By PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D., LL. D., Union Theological Seminary, New York.

(AN ADVANCE CHAPTER FROM HIS HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION.)

I. Sources. *Acta et res gestæ D M Luth. in Comitiis Principum Wormatiæ.* Anno 1521. 4°. *Acta Lutheri in Comitiis Wormatiæ ed. Pollicarius*, Viteb. 1546. These and other contemporary documents are reprinted in the Jena ed. of Luther's *Opera* (1557), vol. II.; in WALCH'S German ed., vols. XV., 2018–2325, and XXII., 2026 sqq.; and the Erlangen-Frankf. ed. of the *Opera Lat.*, vol. VI. (1872); *Vermischte deutsche Schriften*, vol. XII. (or *Sämmtl. Werke*, vol. LXIV., pub. 1855), pp. 366–383. FÖRSTEMANN: *Neues Urkendenbuch*, 1842, vol. I. LUTHER'S Letters to Spalatin, Cuspinianus, Lucas Cranach, Charles V., etc., see in DE WETTE, I. 586 sqq. SPALATIN: *Ann.* Spalatin is also, according to Köstlin, the author of the contemporary pamphlet: *Etliche wunderliche fleissige Handlung in D. M. Luther's Sachen durch geistliche und weltliche Fürsten des Reich's;* but Brieger (in his "Zeitschrift für Kirchengesch." Gotha, 1886, p. 482 sqq.) ascribes it to Rudolph von Watzdorf.

On the Roman Cath. side, COCHLÆUS (who was present at Worms); PALLAVICINI (who used the letters of Aleander); and especially the letters and dispatches of ALEANDER, now published as follows: JOHANN FRIEDRICH: *Der Reichstag zu Worms in Jahr 1521. Nach den Briefen des päpstlichen Nuntius Hieronymus Aleander.* In the "Abhandlungen der Bayer. Akad.," vol. XI. München, 1870. PI-

ETRO BALAN (R. Cath.): *Monumenta Reform. Lutheranæ ex tabulariis S. Sedis secretis.* 1521–1525. Ratisb. Fasc. I., 1883. Contains Aleander's reports from the papal archives, and is one of the first fruits of the liberal policy of Leo XIII. in opening the literary treasures of the Vatican. THEOD. BRIEGER (Prof. of Ch. Hist. in Leipzig); *Aleander und Luther, 1521. Die vervollständigten Aleander-Depeschen nebst Untersuchungen über den Wormser Reichstag.* 1 Abth. Gotha. 1884 (315 pages). Gives the Aleander dispatches in Italian and Latin from a MS. in the library of Trent, and supplements and partly corrects, in the chronology, the edition of Balan.

II. Special Treatises. BOYE: *Luther zu Worms.* Halle, 1817, 1824. ZIMMER: *Luther zu Worms.* Heidelb. 1521. TUZSCHMANN: *Luther in Worms.* Darmstadt, 1860. SOLDAN: *Der Reichstag zu Worms.* Worms, 1863. STEITZ: *Die Melanchthon- und Luther-Herbergen zu Frankfurt-a-M.* Frankf., 1861. Contains the reports of the Frankfurt delegate Fürstenberg, and other documents. HENNES (R. Cath.): *M. Luther's Aufenthalt in Worms.* Mainz, 1868. WALTZ: *Der Wormser Reichstag und seine Beziehungen zur reformator. Bewegung*, in the "Forschungen zur deutschen Gesch." Göttingen, 1868, VIII. pp. 21–44. DAN. SCHENKEL: *Luther in Worms.* Elberfeld, 1870. JUL. KÖSTLIN: *Luther's Rede in Worms am 18. April, 1521.* Halle, 1874 (the best on Luther's famous declaration). MAURENBRECHER: *Der Wormser Reichstag von 1521*, in his "Studien und Skizzen zur Gesch. der Reform. Zeit," Leipzig, 1874 (pp. 241–275); also in his *Gesch. der kathol. Reformation*, Nördlingen, 1880, vol. I., pp. 181–201. KARL JANSEN (not to be confounded with the Rom.-Cath. Janssen): *Aleander am Reichstage zu Worms, 1521.* Kiel, 1883 (72 pages). Corrects Friedrich's text of Aleander's letters. TH. KOLDE: *Luther und der Reichstag zu Worms.* 2d. ed. Halle, 1883. BRIEGER: *Neue Mittheilungen über L. in Worms.* Program to the Luther jubilee, Marburg, 1883 (a critique of Balan's *Monumenta*). KALKOFF: Germ. transl. of the Aleander Dispatches, Halle, 1886.

III. RANKE, I. 311–343. GIESELER, IV. 56–58 (Am. ed.). MERLE D'AUB., Bk. VII. chs I.–XI. HAGENBACH, III. 103–109. G. P. FISHER, pp. 108–111. KÖSTLIN, chs. XVII. and XVIII. (I. 411–466). KOLDE, I. 325 sqq. JANSSEN (R. Cath.), II. 131–166. G. WEBER: *Das Zeitalter der Reformation* (vol. X. of his *Weltgeschichte*), Leipzig, 1886, pp. 162–178. BAUMGARTEN: *Gesch. Karls V.* Leipzig, 1885, vol. I. 379–460.

On the 28th of January, 1521, Charles V. opened his first Diet at Worms. This was a free imperial city on the left bank of the Rhine, in the present grand-duchy of Hesse.* It is

* Worms is 26 miles S. S. E. of Mainz (Mayence or Mentz, the ancient

famous in German song as the scene of the *Niebelungenlied*, which opens with King Günther of Worms and his sister, Chriemhild, the world's wonder for grace and beauty. It is equally famous in ecclesiastical history for "the Concordat of Worms," which brought to an end the long contest between the Emperor and the Pope about investiture (Sept. 23, 1122.) But its greatest fame the city acquired by Luther's heroic stand on the word of God and the rights of conscience, which made the Diet of 1521 one of the most important in the history of German Diets. After that event two conferences of Protestants and Roman-Catholic leaders were held in Worms, to heal the breach of the Reformation,—one in 1541, and one in 1557; but both failed of their object. In 1868 (June 25) a splendid monument to Luther and his fellow-laborers by Rietschel was erected at Worms, and dedicated with great national enthusiasm.*

The religious question threw all the political and financial questions into the background, and absorbed the attention of the public mind.

At the very beginning of the Diet a new papal brief called upon the Emperor to give, by an imperial edict, legal force to the bull of January 3, by which Luther was finally excommunicated, and his books condemned to the flames. The Pope urged him to prove his zeal for the unity of the Church. God had girded him with supreme earthly power, that he might use it against heretics who were much worse than infidels.† On

---

Moguntiacum, the capital of Rhenish Hesse since 1815), and has now over 20,000 inhabitants, about one-half of them Protestants, but in the beginning of the seventeenth century it had 70,000. It was almost destroyed under Louis XIV. (1683). The favorite German wine, *Liebfrauenmilch*, is cultivated in its neighborhood.

* See description of the celebration by Dr. Friedrich Eich, *Gedenkblätter*, Worms, 1868; and his book on the controversy about the locality of the Diet, *In welchem Locale stand Luther zu Worms vor Kaiser und Reich?* Leipzig, 1863. He decides for the *Bishofshof* (against the *Rathhaus*).

† "*Multo deteriores hæreticos.*" The new papal bull of condemnation, together with a brief to the Emperor, arrived in Worms the 10th of February. Aleander addressed the Diet three days after, on Ash Wednesday. Ranke, I., 329. Köstlin, I., 422 sq.

Maundy Thursday, March 28, the Pope, in proclaiming the terrible bull *In Cœna Domini*, which is annually read at Rome, expressly condemned, among other heretics, Martin Luther by name with all his adherents. This was the third or fourth excommunication, but produced little effect.*

The Pope was ably represented by two Italian legates, who were afterwards created cardinals,—Marino Caracciolo (1459–1538) for the political affairs, and Jerome Aleander (1480–1542) for the ecclesiastical interests. Aleander was at that time librarian of the Vatican, and enjoyed great reputation as a Greek scholar. He had lectured at Paris before two thousand hearers of all classes. He stood in friendly relations to Erasmus; but when the latter showed sympathy with the Reformation, he denounced him as the chief founder of the Lutheran heresy. He was an intense papist, and skilled in all the arts of diplomacy. His religious wants were not very pressing. During the Diet of Worms he scarcely found time, in the holy week, "to occupy himself a little with Christ and his conscience." His sole object was to maintain the power of the Pope, and to annihilate the new heresy. In his letters he calls Luther a fool, a dog, a basilisk, a ribald. He urged everywhere the wholesale burning of his books.† He employed argument, persuasion, promises, threats, spies, and bribes. He complained that he could not get money enough from Rome for greedy officials. He labored day and night with the Emperor, his confessor, and the members of the privy council. He played on their fears of a popular revolution, and reminded them of the example of the Bohemians, the worst and most troublesome of heretics. He did not shrink from the terrible threat, "If ye Germans who pay least into the Pope's treasury shake off his yoke, we shall take care

*Luther published this bull afterwards with biting, abusive and contemptuous comments, under the title, *Die Bulla vom Abendfressen des allerheiligsten Herrn, des Papsts.* In Walch XV., 2127 sqq. Merle d'Aubigné gives characteristic extracts, Bk. VII. ch. 5.

†Janssen, who praises him very highly, remarks (II. 144): "*Um der Häresie Einhalt zu thun, hielt Aleander die Verbrennung der lutherischen Bücher für ein überaus geeignetes Mittel.*" But I can not see why he says (p. 142) that Aleander prided himself on being "a German." Aleander was born in Italy, hated the Germans, and died in Rome.

that ye mutually kill yourselves, and wade in your own blood." He addressed the Diet, Feb. 13, in a speech of three hours, and contended that Luther's final condemnation left no room for a further hearing of the heretic, but imposed upon the Emperor and the Estates the simple duty to execute the requirements of the papal bull.

The Emperor hesitated between his religious impulses—which were decidedly Roman Catholic, though with a leaning towards disciplinary reform through a council—and political considerations which demanded caution and forbearance. He had already taken lessons in the art of dissimulation, which was deemed essential to a ruler in those days. He had to respect the wishes of the Estates, and could not act without their consent. Public sentiment was divided, and there was a possibility of utilizing the dissatisfaction with Rome for his interest. He was displeased with Leo for favoring the election of Francis, and trying to abridge the powers of the Spanish Inquisition; and yet he felt anxious to secure his support in the impending struggle with France, and the Pope met him half-way by recalling his steps against the Inquisition. He owed a debt of gratitude to the Elector Frederick, and had written to him, Nov. 28, 1520, to bring Luther to Worms, that he might have a hearing before learned men; but the Elector declined the offer, fearing the result. On the 17th of December, the Emperor advised him to keep Luther at Wittenberg, as he had been condemned at Rome.

At first he inclined to severe measures, and laid the draft of an edict before the Diet whereby the bull of excommunication should be legally enforced throughout all Germany. But this was resisted by the Estates, and other influences were brought to bear upon him. Then he tried indirectly, and in a private way, a compromise through his confessor, John Glapio, a Franciscan friar, who professed some sympathy with reform, and respect for Luther's talent and zeal. He held several interviews with Dr. Brück (Pontanus), the Chancellor of the Elector Frederick. He assured him of great friendship, and proposed that he should induce Luther to disown or to retract the book on the "Babylonian Captivity," which was detestable; in this case, his other writings, which contained so much that is good, would

bear fruit to the Church, and Luther might co-operate with the Emperor in the work of a true (that is, Spanish) reformation of ecclesiastical abuses. We have no right to doubt his sincerity any more than that of the like-minded Hadrian VI., the teacher of Charles. But the Elector would not listen to such a proposal, and refused a private audience to Glapio. His conference with Hutten and Sickingen on the Ebernburg was equally unsuccessful.*

The Estates were in partial sympathy with the Reformation, not from doctrinal and religious, but from political and patriotic motives; they repeated the old one hundred and one *gravamina* against the tyranny and extortions of the Roman See† (similar to the charges in Luther's Address to the German Nobility), and resisted a condemnation of Luther without giving him a hearing. Even his greatest enemy, Duke George of Saxony, declared that the Church suffered most from the immorality of the clergy, and that a general reformation was most necessary, which could be best secured by a general council.

During the Diet, Ulrich von Hutten exerted all his power of invective against the Pope and for Luther. He was harbored at Ebernburg, a few leagues from Worms, with his friend, the valorous Francis of Sickingen. He poured contempt and ridicule on the speech of Aleander, and even attempted to catch him and Caracciolo by force.‡ But he and Sickingen favored, at the same time, the cause of the young Emperor, from whom they expected great things, and wished to bring about an anti-papal revolution with his aid. Hutten called upon him to dis-

---

*See Brück's conversations with Glapio in Förstemann, I., pp. 53, 54. Erasmus and Hutten regarded him as a crafty hypocrite, who wished to ruin Luther. Strauss agrees, *Ulrich von Hutten*, p. 405. But Maurenbrecher, (*Studien*, etc., pp. 258 sqq., and *Gesch. der kath. Ref.*, I. 187 sqq.) thinks that Glapio presented the program of the imperial policy of reform. Janssen, II., 153 sq., seems to be of the same opinion.

†See the list in Walch, XV., 2058 sqq.

‡Luther, in a letter to Spalatin (Nov. 23, 1520, in De Wette I. 523), in a moment of indignation expressed a wish that Hutten might have *intercepted* (*utinam*—INTERCEPISSET) the legates, but not *murdered*, as Romanists (Janssen, twice, II. 104, 143) misinterpret it. See Köstlin, I. 411, and note on p. 797.

miss his clerical counsellors, to stand on his own dignity, to give Luther a hearing, and to build up a free Germany. Freedom was now in the air, and all men of intelligence longed for a new and better order of things.*

Aleander was scarcely safe on the street after his speech of February 13. He reported to his master, that for nine-tenths of the Germans the name of Luther was a war-cry, and that the last tenth screamed "Death to the court of Rome!" Cochlæus, who was in Worms as the theological adviser of the Archbishop of Treves, feared a popular uprising against the clergy.

Luther was the hero of the day, and called a new Moses, a second Paul. His tracts and picture, surrounded by a halo of glory, were freely circulated in Worms.†

At last Charles thought it most prudent to disregard the demand of the Pope, In an official letter of March 6, he cited Luther to appear before the Diet within twenty-one days under the sure protection of the Empire. The Elector Frederick, Duke George of Saxony, and the Landgrave of Hesse, added letters of safe-conduct through their respective territories.‡

Aleander now endeavored to make the appearance of Luther as harmless as possible, and succeeded in preventing any discussion with him. The heretic was simply to recant, or, in case of refusal, to suffer the penalties of excommunication.

LUTHER'S JOURNEY TO WORMS.

"Mönchlein, Mönchlein, du gehest einen schweren Gang."

Luther, from the first intimation of a summons by the Emperor, regarded it as a call from God, and declared his determi-

---

*See Aleander's dispatches in Brieger, *l. c.* I. pp. 119 sqq.; Strauss, *Ulrich von Hutten*, 4th ed., pp. 395 sqq.; and Ullman, *Franz von Sickingen* (Leipzig, 1872).

†Aleander reports (April 13) that Luther was painted with the Holy Spirit over his head (*el spirito santo sopra il capo, come lo depingono*). Brieger, I. 139.

‡The letters of safe-conduct are printed in Walch, XV., 2122–2127, and Förstemann, *Neues Urkundenbuch*, I., 61 sq. In the imperial letter signed by Albert, Elector and Archbishop of Mayence and Chancellor of the Empire, Luther is addressed as "honorable, well-beloved, pious" (*Ehrsamer, Geliebter, Andächtiger;* in the Latin copy, *Honorabilis, Dilecte, Devote*), much to the chagrin of the Romanists.

nation to go to Worms, though he should be carried there sick, and at the risk of his life. His motive was not to gratify an unholy ambition, but to bear witness to the truth. He well knew the tragic fate which overtook Hus at Constance notwithstanding the safe-conduct, but his faith inspired him with fearless courage. "You may expect everything from me," he wrote to Spalatin, "except fear or recantation. I shall not flee, still less recant. May the Lord Jesus strengthen me."*

He shared for a while the hope of Hutten and Sickingen, that the young Emperor would give him at least fair play, and renew the old conflict of Germany with Rome; but he was doomed to disappointment.

While the negotiations in Worms were going on, he used incessantly his voice and his pen, and alternated between devotional and controversial exercises. He often preached twice a day, wrote commentaries on Genesis, the Psalms, and the Magnificat (the last he finished in March), and published the first part of his *Postil* (Sermons on the Gospels and Epistles), a defense of his propositions condemned by Rome, and fierce polemical books against Hieronymus Emser, Ambrose Catharinus, and other papal opponents.

Emser, a learned Romanist, and secretary of Duke George of Saxony, had first attacked Luther after the Leipzig disputation, at which he was present. A bitter controversy followed, in which both forgot dignity and charity. Luther called Emser "the Goat of Leipzig" (in reference to the escutcheon of his family), and Emser called Luther in turn "the Capricorn of Wittenberg." Luther's *Antwort auf das überchristliche, übergeistliche, und überkünstliche Buch Bock Emser's*, appeared in March, 1521, and defends his doctrine of the general priesthood of believers.† Emser afterwards severely criticised Luther's transla-

*Letter of Dec. 21, 1520 (De Wette, I., 534, 536): "Ego vero, si vocatus fuero, quantum per me stabit, vel ægrotus advehar, si sanus venire non possem. Neque enim dubitari fas est, a Domino me vocari, si Cæsar vocat. . . . Omnia de me præsumas præter fugam et palinodiam: fugere ipse nolo, recantare multo minus. Ita me comfortet Dominus Jesus."

†On the Emser controversy see Erl. Frkf. ed., vol. XXVII.

tion of the Bible, and published his own version of the New Testament shortly before his death (1527).

Catharinus,* an eminent Dominican at Rome, had attacked Luther toward the end of December, 1520. Luther in his Latin reply tried to prove from Dan. 8 : 25 sqq.; 2 Thess. 2 : 3 sqq.; 2 Tim. 4 : 3 sqq.; 2 Pet. 2 : 1 sqq.; and the Epistle of Jude, that popery was the Antichrist predicted in the Scriptures, and would soon be annihilated by the Lord himself at his second coming, which he thought to be near at hand.

It is astonishing that in the midst of the war of theological passions, he could prepare such devotional books as his commentaries and sermons, which are full of faith and practical comfort. He lived and moved in the heart of the Scriptures; and this was the secret of his strength and success.

On the second of April, Luther left Wittenberg, accompanied by Amsdorf, his friend and colleague, Peter Swaven, a Danish student, and Johann Pezensteiner, an Augustinian brother. Thus the faculty, the students, and his monastic order were represented. They rode in an open farmer's wagon, provided by the magistrate of the city. The imperial herald in his coat-of-arms preceded on horseback. Melanchthon wished to accompany his friend, but he was needed at home. "If I do not return," said Luther in taking leave of him, "and my enemies murder me, I conjure thee, dear brother, to persevere in teaching the truth. Do my work during my absence: you can do it better than I. If you remain, I can well be spared. In thee the Lord has a more learned champion."

At Weimar, Justus Jonas joined the company. He was at that time professor and canon at Erfurt. In June of the same year he moved to Wittenberg as professor of church law and provost, and became one of the most intimate friends and co-workers of Luther. He accompanied him on his last journey

*His proper name was Lancelot Politi. See Lämmer, *Vortridentinische Theologie*, p. 21, and Burkhardt, *Luther's Briefwechsel*, p. 38. Luther calls him, "*insulsus et stolidus Thomista*," in a letter to Spalatin, March 7, 1521 (De Wette, I. 570).

to Eisleben, and left us a description of his closing days. He translated several of his and Melanchthon's works.

The journey to Worms resembled a march of triumph, but clouded with warnings of friends and threats of foes. In Leipzig, Luther was honorably received by the magistrate, notwithstanding his enemies in the University. In Thuringia, the people rushed to see the man who had dared to defy the Pope and all the world.

At Erfurt, where he had studied law and passed three years in a monastic cell, he was enthusiastically saluted, and treated as "the hero of the gospel." Before he reached the city, a large procession of professors and students of his *alma mater*, headed by his friends Crotus the rector, and Eoban the Latin poet, met him. Everybody rushed to see the procession. The streets, the walls, and roofs were covered with people, who almost worshiped Luther as a wonder-working saint. The magistrate gave him a banquet, and overwhelmed him with demonstrations of honor. He lodged in the Augustinian convent with his friend Lange. On Sunday, April 7, he preached on his favorite doctrine, salvation by faith in Jesus Christ, and against the intolerable yoke of popery. Eoban, who heard him, reports that he melted the hearts as the vernal sun melts the snow, and that neither Demosthenes nor Cicero nor Paul so stirred their audiences as Luther's sermons stirred the people on the shores of the Gera.*

During the sermon a crash in the balconies of the crowded church scared the hearers, who rushed to the door; but Luther allayed the panic by raising his hand, and assuring them that it was only a wicked sport of the Devil.†

---

*A full description of the reception at Erfurt, with extracts from the speech of Crotus and the poems of Eoban, is given by Professor Kampschulte (a liberal Catholic historian), in his valuable monograph, *Die Universität Erfurt*, vol. II. 95–100. "It seems," he says, "that the nation at this moment wished to make every effort to assure Luther of his vocation. The glorifications which he received from the 2d to the 16th of April no doubt contributed much to fill him with that self-confidence which he manifested in the decisive hour. Nowhere was he received more splendidly than at Erfurt."

†"*Seid still*," he said, "*liebes Volk, es ist der Teufel, der richtet so eine*

In Gotha and Eisenach he preached likewise to crowded houses. At Eisenach he fell sick, and was bled; but a cordial and good sleep restored him sufficiently to proceed on the next day. He ascribed the sickness to the Devil, the recovery to God. In the inns, he used to take up his lute, and to refresh himself with music.

He arrived at Frankfurt, completely exhausted, on Sunday, April 14. On Monday he visited the high school of William Nesse, blessed the children and exhorted them "to be diligent in reading the Scriptures and investigating the truth." He also became acquainted with a noble patrician family, von Holzhausen, who took an active part in the subsequent introduction of the Reformation in that city.*

As he proceeded, the danger increased, and with it his courage. Before he left Wittenberg, the Emperor had issued an edict ordering all his books to be seized, and forbidding their sale.† The herald informed him of it already at Weimar, and asked him, "Herr Doctor, will ye proceed?" He replied, "Yes." The edict was placarded in all the cities. Spalatin, who knew the critical situation, warned him by special messen-

---

Spiegelfechterei an; seid still, es hat keine Noth." Some of his indiscreet admirers called this victory over the imaginary Devil the first miracle of Luther. The second miracle, they thought, he performed at Gotha, where the Devil played a similar trick in the church, and met with the same defeat.

*His brief sojourn at Frankfurt, and his contact with the Holzhausen family, is made the subject of an interesting historical novel: *Haman von Holzhausen. Eine Frankfurter Patriziergeschichte nach Familienpapieren erzählt von M. K.* [*Maria Krummacher*]. Bielefeld and Leipzig, 1885. See especially chap. XX., pp. 253, sqq.

†The edict is dated March 10. See Burkhardt, *Luther's Briefwechsel* (1866), p. 38, who refers to Spalatin's MS. Seidemann dates the letter from March 2. Ranke, in the sixth ed. (1881), I. 333, says that it was published March 27, on the doors of the churches at Worms. Luther speaks of it in his Eisleben report and says that the edict was a device of the Archbishop of Mainz to keep him away from Worms, and tempt him to despise the order of the Emperor. *Works*, Erl. Frankf. ed., LXIV. 367.

ger, in the name of the Elector his patron, not to come to Worms, lest he might suffer the fate of Hus.*

Luther comforted his timid friends with the words: Though Hus was burned, the truth was not burned, and Christ still lives. He wrote to Spalatin from Frankfurt, that he had been unwell ever since he left Eisenach, and had heard of the Emperor's edict, but that he would go to Worms in spite of all the gates of hell and the evil spirits in the air.† The day after, he sent him from Oppenheim (between Mainz and Worms) the famous words:

"I shall go to Worms, though there were as many devils there as tiles on the roofs."‡

A few days before his death at Eisleben, he thus described his feelings at that critical period: "I was fearless, I was afraid of nothing; God can make one so desperately bold. I know not whether I could be so cheerful now."§ Mathesius says, with reference to this courage: "If the cause is good, the heart expands, giving courage and energy to evangelists and soldiers."

Sickingen invited Luther, through Martin Bucer, in person, to his castle Ebernburg, where he would be perfectly safe under the protection of friends. Glapio favored the plan, and wished

---

*Notwithstanding this danger, Janssen thinks (II. 158) that it required no "special courage" for Luther to go to Worms.

†April 14 (De Wette, I. 587): "*Christus vivit, et intrabimus Wormatiam invitis omnibus portis inferni et potentatibus æris*" (Eph. 2 : 2).

‡Spalatin reports the saying thus: *Dass er mir Spalatino aus Oppenheim gen Worms schrieb: 'Er wollte gen Worms wenn gleich so viel Teufel darinnen wären als immer Ziegel da wären'* " (Walch, XV. 2174). A year afterwards, in a letter to the Elector Frederick, March 5, 1522 (De Wette, II. 139), Luther gives the phrase with this modification: "*Er* [the Devil] *sah mein Herz wohl, da ich zu Worms einkam, dass, wenn ich hätte gewusst, dass so viel Teufel auf mich gehalten hätten, als Ziegel auf den Dächern sind, wäre ich dennoch mitten unter sie gesprungen mit Freuden.*" In the verbal report he gave to his friends at Eisleben in 1546 (Erl. Frankf. ed., vol. LXIV. p. 368): "*Ich entbot ihm* [Spalatin] *wieder: 'Wenn so viel Teufel zu Worms wären als Ziegel auf den Dächern, noch* [doch] *wollt ich hinein.*"

§Ibid: "*Denn ich war unerschrocken, fürchtete mich nichts; Gott kann einen wohl so toll machen. Ich weiss nicht, ob ich jetzt auch so freudig wäre.*"

to have a personal conference with Luther about a possible compromise and co-operation in a moderate scheme of reform. But Luther would not be diverted from his aim, and sent word, that, if the Emperor's confessor wished, he could see him in Worms.

Luther arrived in Worms on Tuesday morning, April 16, 1521, at ten o'clock, shortly before early dinner, in an open carriage with his Wittenberg companions, preceded by the imperial herald, and followed by a number of gentlemen on horseback. He was dressed in his monastic gown.* The watchman on the tower of the cathedral announced the arrival of the procession by blowing the horn, and thousands of people gathered to see the heretic.†

As he stepped from the carriage, he said, "God will be with me."

The papal legate reports this fact to Rome, and adds that Luther looked around with the eyes of a demon.‡ Cardinal Cajetan was similarly struck at Augsburg with the mysterious fire of the "profound eyes," and the "wonderful speculations," of the German monk.

Luther was lodged in the house of the Knights of St. John with two counselors of the Elector. He received visitors till late at night.§

The city was in a fever-heat of excitement and expectation.

LUTHER'S TESTIMONY BEFORE THE DIET. APRIL 17 AND 18, 1521.

On the day after his arrival, in the afternoon at four o'clock, Luther was led by the imperial marshal, Ulrich von Pappenheim, and the herald, Caspar Sturm, through circuitous side-

---

*See Luther's picture of that year, by Cranach, in the small biography of Köstlin, p. 237 (Scribner's ed.) It is very different from those to which we are accustomed.

†"*Nun fuhr ich,*" says Luther (LXIV. 368), "*auf einem offenen Wäglein in meiner Kappen zu Worms ein. Da kamen alle Leute auf die Gassen und wollten den Mönch D. Martinum sehen.*"

‡Aleander to Vice-Chancellor Medici, from Worms, April 16: "*Esso Luther in descensu currus versis huc et illuc demoniacis oculis disse: 'Deus erit pro me.'*" Brieger, I. 143.

§"*Tutto il mondo,*" writes Aleander in the same letter, "went to see Luther after dinner."

streets, avoiding the impassable crowds, to the hall of the Diet in the bishop's palace where the Emperor and his brother Ferdinand resided. He was admitted at about 6 o'clock. There he stood, a poor monk of rustic manners, yet a genuine hero and confessor, with the fire of genius and enthusiasm flashing from his eyes and the expression of intense earnestness and thoughtfulness on his face, before a brilliant assembly such as he had never seen: the young Emperor, six Electors (including his own sovereign), the Pope's legates, archbishops, bishops, dukes, margraves, princes, counts, deputies of the imperial cities, ambassadors of foreign courts, and a numerous array of dignitaries of every rank; in one word, a fair representation of the highest powers in Church and State.* Several thousand spectators were collected in and around the building and in the streets, anxiously waiting for the issue.

Dr. Johann von Eck,† as the official of the Archbishop of Treves, put to him, in the name of the Emperor, simply two questions in Latin and German,—first, whether he acknowledged the books laid before him on a bench (about twenty-five in number) to be his own; and, next, whether he would retract them. Dr. Schurf, Luther's colleague and advocate, who stood beside him, demanded that the titles of those books be read.‡ This was done. Among them were some such inoffensive and purely devotional books as an exposition of the Lord's Prayer and of the Psalms.

Luther was apparently overawed by the august assembly, nervously excited, unprepared for a summary condemnation

---

*Walch, XV. 2225–2231, gives a list of over two hundred members of the Diet that were present.

†Not to be confounded with the more famous Dr. Eck of Ingolstadt. Aleander, who lodged with him on the same floor, calls him "*Homo literatissimo*" and "*orthodoxo*," who had already done good service in the execution of the papal demands at Treves. Brieger, I. 146. In a dispatch of April 29, he solicits a present for him from the Roman See. ("*Al official de Treveri un qualche presente sarebbe util*," etc., p. 174). Froude, in his *Luther* (pp. 32, 33, 35), confounds the Eck of Treves with the Eck of Ingolstadt, Aleander with Cajetan, and makes several other blunders, which spoil his lively description of the scene at Worms.

‡*Legantur tituli librorum*," he cried aloud.

without an examination, and spoke in a low, almost inaudible tone. Many thought that he was about to collapse. He acknowledged in both languages the authorship of the books; but as to the more momentous question of recantation he humbly requested further time for consideration, since it involved the salvation of the soul, and the truth of the word of God, which was higher than any thing else in heaven or on earth.

We must respect him all the more for this reasonable request, which proceeded not from want of courage, but from a profound sense of responsibility.

The Emperor, after a brief consultation, granted him "out of his clemency" a respite of one day.

Aleander reported on the same day to Rome, that the heretical "fool" entered laughing, and left despondent; that even among his sympathizers some regarded him now as a fool, others as one possessed by the Devil; while many looked upon him as a saint full of the Holy Spirit; but in any case, he had lost much of his reputation.*

The shrewd Italian judged too hastily. On the same evening Luther recollected himself, and wrote to a friend: "I shall not retract one iota, so Christ help me."†

On Thursday, the 18th of April, Luther appeared a second and last time before the Diet.

It was the greatest day in his life. He never appeared more heroic and sublime. He never represented a principle of more vital and general importance to Christendom.

On his way to the Diet, an old warrior, Georg von Frundsberg, is reported to have clapped him on the shoulder, with these words of cheer: "My poor monk, my poor monk, thou

---

*Letter to Vice-Chancellor Medici, Worms, April 17, 1521 (in Brieger, *l. c.* p. 147): "*El pazzo era entrato ridendo et coram Cesare girava il capo continuamente quà et là, alto e basso; poi nel partir non parea così allegro. Quì molti di quelli et* [= *etiam*] *che lo favoreggiavano, poi che l'hanno visto, l'hanno existimado chi pazzo, chi demoniaco molti altri santo et pieno di spiritu santo; tutta volta ha perso in ogni modo molta reputatione della opinione prima.*"

†April 17, to John Cuspinianus, an imperial counsellor. See De Wette, I. 587 sq.

art going to make such a stand as neither I nor any of my companions in arms have ever done in our hottest battles. If thou art sure of the justice of thy cause, then forward in God's name, and be of good courage: God will not forsake thee."*

He was again kept waiting two hours outside the hall, among a dense crowd, but appeared more cheerful and confident than the day before. He had fortified himself by prayer and meditation, and was ready to risk life itself to his honest conviction of divine truth. The torches were lighted when he was admitted.

Dr. Eck, speaking again in Latin and German, reproached him for asking delay, and put the second question in this modified form: Wilt thou defend *all* the books which thou dost acknowledge to be thine, or recant some part?"

Luther answered in a well-considered, premeditated speech, with modesty and firmness, and a voice that could be heard all over the hall.†

After apologizing for his ignorance of courtly manners, having been brought up in monastic simplicity, he divided his books into three classes:‡ (1) Books which simply set forth evangelical truths, professed alike by friend and foe: these he could not retract. (2) Books against the corruption and abuses of the papacy which vexed and martyred the conscience, and devoured the property of the German nation: these he could not retract without cloaking wickedness and tyrrany. (3) Books

---

*"*Mönchlein, Mönchlein, du gehst jetzt einen Gang, dergleichen ich und mancher Oberster auch in unserer allerernstesten Schlachtordnung nicht gethan haben,*" etc. The saying is reported by Mathesius (who puts it on the second day of trial, not on the first, as Köstlin and others), by Spangenberg, and Seckendorf (Leipsic ed. of 1694, vol. I. 156, in Latin and German.

†"*Respondit Doctor Martinus et ipse latine et germanice, quanquam suppliciter, non clamose, ac modeste, non tamen sine Christiana animositate et constantia.*" *Acta*, etc. (*Op. Lat.* VI. 9). He began with the customary titles; "*Allerdurchlauchtigster, grossmächtigster Kaiser, Durchlauchtige Churfürsten, gnädigste und gnädige Herren!*" These fulsome titles are used to this day in Germany, as if a king or emperor were mightier than the Almighty.

‡In his report at Eisleben, he calls the three classes briefly *Lehrbücher*, *Zankbücher*, and *Disputationes*.

against his popish opponents: in these he confessed to have been more violent than was proper, but even these he could not retract without giving aid and comfort to his enemies, who would triumph and make things worse. In defense of his books he could only say in the words of Christ: "If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil; but if well, why smitest thou me?" If his opponents could convict him of error by prophetic and evangelical Scriptures, he would revoke his books, and be the first to commit them to the flames. He concluded with a warning to the young Emperor not to begin his reign by condemning the word of God, and pointed to the judgments over Pharaoh, the king of Babylon, and the ungodly kings of Israel.

He was requested to repeat his speech in Latin.* This he did with equal firmness and with eyes upraised to heaven.

The princes held a short consultation. Eck, in the name of the Emperor, sharply reproved him for evading the question; it was useless, he said, to dispute with him about views which were not new, but had been already taught by Hus, Wiclif, and other heretics, and had been condemned for sufficient reasons by the Council of Constance before the Pope, the Emperor, and the assembled fathers. He demanded a round and direct answer "without horns."

This brought on the crisis.

Luther replied, he would give an answer "with neither horns nor teeth."† From the inmost depths of his conscience educa-

---

*So Luther says himself (in his Eisleben report of the Worms events, in the Erl. Frkf. ed., vol. LXIV. 370): "*Dieweil ich redete, begehrten sie von mir, ich sollt es noch einmal wiederholen mit lateinischen Worten . . . Ich wiederholte alle meine Worte lateinisch. Das gefiel Herzog Friedrich, dem Churfürsten überaus wohl.*" Spalatin confirms this in *Epitome Actorum Lutheri*, etc.: *Dixit primo germanice, deinde latine.*" Other reports put the Latin speech first; so the *Acta Luth.* (in the Erl. Frkf. ed. of *Op. Lat.*, VI. 9: *respondit D. Martinus et ipse latine et germanice*). Köstlin follows the latter report (I. 445, 451), and overlooked the testimony of Luther, who must have known best.

†In the German text, "*ein unstüssige und unbeissige Antwort*" (vol. LXIV. 382); i. e., an answer neither offensive nor biting—with reference, no doubt, to his concluding warning.

ted by the study of the word of God, he made in both languages that memorable declaration which marks an epoch in the history of religious liberty :—

"Unless I am refuted and convicted by testimonies of the Scriptures or by clear arguments (since I believe neither the Pope nor the councils alone; it being evident that they have often erred and contradicted themselves), I am conquered by the Holy Scriptures quoted by me, and my conscience is bound in the word of God: I can not and will not recant any thing, since it is unsafe and dangerous to do any thing against the conscience."*

So far the reports are clear and harmonious. What followed immediately after this testimony is somewhat uncertain and of less importance.

Dr. Eck exchanged a few more words with Luther, protesting against his assertion that councils may err and have erred. "You can not prove it," he said. Luther repeated his assertion, and pledged himself to prove it. Thus pressed and threatened,

---

*We give also the German and Latin texts. "*Weil denn Eure Kaiserliche Majestät und Eure Gnaden eine schlichte Antwort begehren, so will ich eine Antwort ohne Hörner und Zähne geben diesermassen: 'Es sei denn, dass ich durch Zeugnisse der Schrift oder durch helle Gründe überwunden werde—denn ich glaube weder dem Papst, noch den Konzilien allein, dieweil am Tag liegt, dass sie öfters geirrt und sich selbst widersprochen haben,—so bin ich überwunden durch die von mir angeführten heiligen Schriften, und mein Gewissen ist gefangen in Gottes Wort; widerrufen kann ich nichts und will ich nichts, dieweil wider das Gewissen zu handeln unsicher und gefährlich ist.'*" See Köstlin, I. 452. The oldest reports vary a little in the language. Some have *scheinbarliche und merkliche Ursachen* for *helle Gründe*, and at the close: "*dieweil wider das Gewissen zu handeln beschwerlich und unheilsam, auch gefährlich ist.*" *Werke* (Erl. Frkf. ed.), vol. LXIV. 382.

The Latin text as given in the *Acta Lutheri Wormatiæ habita* is as follows: *Hic Lutherus: Quando ergo serenissima Majestas vestra Dominationesque vestræ simplex responsum petunt, dabo illud, neque cornutum, neque dentatum, in hunc modum: "Nisi convictus fuero testimoniis Scripturarum, aut ratione evidente (nam neque Papæ, neque Conciliis solis credo, cum constet eos errasse sæpius, et sibi ipsis contradixisse), victus sum Scripturis a me adductis captaque est conscientia in verbis Dei; revocare neque possum neque volo quidquam, cum contra conscientiam agere neque tutum sit, neque integrum.'*" *Opera Lat.* (Frankf. ed.), Vol. VI. 13 sq.

amidst the excitement and confusion of the audience, he uttered in German, at least in substance, that concluding sentence which has impressed itself most on the memory of men:

"Here I stand. [I can not do otherwise.] God help me! Amen."*

The sentence, if not strictly historical, is true to the situation, and expresses Luther's mental condition at the time,—the strength of his conviction, and prayer for God's help, which was abundantly answered. It furnishes a parallel to Galileo's equally famous, but less authenticated, "It does move, for all that" (*E pur si muove*).

The Emperor would hear no more, and abruptly broke up the session of the Diet at eight o'clock, amid general commotion.

On reaching his lodging, Luther threw up his arms, and joyfully exclaimed, "I am through, I am through!" To Spalatin, in the presence of others, he said, "If I had a thousand heads, I would rather have them all cut off one by one than make one recantation."

The impression he made on the audience was different according to conviction and nationality. What some admired as the enthusiasm of faith and the strength of conviction, appeared to others as fanaticism and heretical obstinacy.

The Emperor, a stranger to German thought and speech,† declared after the first hearing: "This man will never make a heretic of me." He doubted the authorship of the famous books ascribed to him.‡ At the second hearing he was horrified at the disparagement of general councils, as if a German

---

*"*Hier steh' ich.* [*Ich kann nich anders*]. *Gott helfe mir! Amen.*" The bracketed words cannot be traced to a primitive source. See the critical note at the close of this section.

†The little German he knew was only the *Platt-Deutsch* of the Low Countries. He always communicated with his German subjects in Latin or French, or by the mouth of his brother Ferdinand.

‡Aleander (*l. c.* p. 170): "*Cesar palam dixit et saepisseme postea repetiit, che mai crederá che l' habbii composto detti libri.*" The mixing of Latin and Italian is characteristic of the Aleander dispatches. He was inclined to ascribe the authorship of the greater part of Luther's books to Melanchthon, of whom he says that he has "*un belissimo, ma malignissimo ingegno*" (p. 172).

monk could be wiser than the whole Catholic Church. The Spaniards and Italians were no doubt of the same opinion; they may have been repelled also by his lowly appearance and want of refined manners. Some of the Spaniards pursued him with hisses as he left the room. The papal legates reported that he raised his hands after the manner of the German soldiers rejoicing over a clever stroke, and represented him as a vulgar fellow fond of good wine.* They praised the Emperor as a truly Christian and Catholic prince who assured them the next day of his determination to treat Luther as a heretic. The Venetian ambassador, otherwise impartial, judged that Luther disappointed expectations, and showed neither much learning, nor much prudence, nor was he blameless in life.†

But the German delegates received a different impression. When Luther left the Bishop's palace greatly exhausted, the old Duke Erik of Brunswick sent him a silver tankard of Eimbeck beer, after having first drunk of it himself to remove suspicion. Luther said, "As Duke Erik has remembered me to-day, may the Lord Jesus remember him in his last agony." The Duke thought of it on his death-bed, and found comfort in the words of the gospel: "Whosoever shall give unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only, in the name of a disciple, he shall in no wise lose his reward." The Elector Frederick expressed to Spalatin the same evening his delight with Luther's conduct: "How excellently did Father Martin speak both in Latin and German before the Emperor and the Estates! He was bold

---

*Aleander and Caracciolo to the Vice-Chancellor Medici, April 19, 1521 (Brieger, I. 153): "*Martino uscito fuora della sala Cesarea alzo la mano in alto more militum Germanorum, quando exultano di un bel colpo di giostra.*" In a letter of April 27 (*l. c.* p. 166), they call Luther "*il venerabile ribaldo,*" who before his departure drank in the presence of many persons "*molte tazze di malvasia, della qual ne é forti amoroso.*" The charge of intemperance is repeated in a dispatch of April 29 (p. 170): "*la ebrietá, alla quale detto Luther è deditissimo.*" That Luther used to drink beer and wine according to the universal custom of his age, is an undoubted fact; but that he was intemperate in eating or drinking, is a slander of his enemies. Melanchthon, who knew him best, bears testimony to his temperance.

†Contarenus ad Matthæum Dandalum, quoted by Ranke, I. 336.

enough, if not too much so."* The cautious Elector would have been still better pleased if Luther had been more moderate, and not attacked the Councils. Persons of distinction called on him in his lodgings till late at night, and cheered him. Among these was the young Landgrave Philip of Hesse, who afterwards embraced the cause of the Reformation with zeal and energy, but did it much harm by his bigamy. After a frivolous jest, which Luther smilingly rebuked, he wished him God's blessing.†

The strongest sympathizers with Luther were outside of the Diet, among the common people, the patriotic nobles, the scholars of the school of Erasmus, and the rising generation of liberal men. As he returned from the Diet to his lodgings, a voice in the crowd was heard to exclaim: "Blessed be the womb that bare this son." Tonstal, the English ambassador, wrote from Worms, that "the Germans everywhere are so addicted to Luther, that, rather than he should be oppressed by the Pope's authority, a hundred thousand of people will sacrifice their lives."‡ In the imperial chambers a paper was found with the words: "Woe to the nation whose king is a child" (Eccl. x. 16).§ An uprising of four hundred German knights with eight thousand soldiers was threatened in a placard on the city hall; but the storm passed away. Hutten and Sickingen were in the Emper-

---

*Walch, XV. 2246.

†The interview as related by Luther (Walch, XV. 2247; Erlangen-Frankfurt edition, LXIV. 373) is characteristic of this prince, and foreshadows his future conduct. "*Der Landgraf von Hesse kam zu Worms erstlich zu mir. Er war aber noch nicht auf meiner Seiten, und kam in Hof geritten, ging zu mir in mein Gemach, wollte mich sehen. Er war aber noch sehr jung, sprach: Lieber Herr Doctor, wie geht's? Da antwortete ich: Gnädiger Herr, ich hoff, es soll gut werden. Da sagte er: Ich höre, Herr Doctor, ihr lehret, wenn ein Mann alt wird und seiner Frauen nicht mehr Ehepflicht leisten kann, dass dann die Frau mag einen anderen Mann nehmen, und lachte, denn die Hofräthe hatten's ihm eingeblasen. Ich aber lachte auch und sagte: Ach nein, gnädiger Herr, Euer Fürstlich Gnad sollt nicht also reden. Aber er ging balde wieder von mir hinweg, gab mir die Hand und sagte: Habt ihr Recht, Herr Doctor, so helfe euch Gott.*"

‡In Fiddes' *Life of Wolsey*, quoted by Ranke, I. 337, note.

§Ranke (I. 337) says "*in den kaiserlichen Gemächern.*" Other reports say that these words were placarded in public places at Worms.

or's service. "Hutten only barks, but does not bite," was a saying in Worms.

The papal party triumphed in the Diet. Nothing else could be expected if the historic continuity of the Latin Church and of the Holy German Roman Empire was to be preserved. Had Luther submitted his case to a general council, to which in the earlier stages of the conflict he had himself repeatedly appealed, the result might have been different, and a moderate reform of the mediæval Church under the headship of the Pope of Rome might have been accomplished; but no more. By denying the infallibility of a council, he openly declared himself a heretic, and placed himself in opposition to the universal opinion, which regarded œcumenical councils, beginning with the first of Nicæa in 325, as the ultimate tribunal for the decision of theological controversies. The infallibility of the Pope was as yet an open question, and remained so till 1870, but the infallibility of a general council was at that time regarded as settled. A protest against it could only be justified by a providential mission and actual success.

It was the will of Providence to prepare the way, through the instrumentality of Luther, for independent church organizations, and the development of new types of Christianity on the basis of the word of God and the freedom of thought.

REFLECTIONS ON LUTHER'S TESTIMONY AT WORMS.

Luther's testimony before the Diet is an event of world-historical importance and far-reaching effect. It opened an intellectual conflict which is still going on in the civilized world. He stood there as the fearless champion of the supremacy of the word of God over the traditions of men, and of the liberty of conscience over the tyranny of authority.

For this liberty, all Protestant Christians, who enjoy the fruit of his courage, owe him a debt of gratitude. His recantation could not, any more than his martyrdom, have stopped the Reformation; but it would have retarded its progress, and indefinitely prolonged the oppressive rule of popery.

When tradition becomes a wall against freedom, when authority degenerates into tyranny, the very blessing is turned into a

curse, and history is threatened with stagnation and death.* At such rare junctures, Providence raises those pioneers of progress, who have the intellectual and moral courage to break through the restraints at the risk of their lives, and to open new paths for the onward march of history. This consideration furnishes the key for the proper appreciation of Luther's determined stand at this historical crisis.

Conscience is the voice of God in man. It is his most sacred possession. No power can be allowed to stand between the gift and the giver. Even an erring conscience must be respected, and cannot be forced. The liberty of conscience was theoretically and practically asserted by the Christians of the ante-Nicene age, against Jewish and heathen persecution; but it was suppressed by the union of Church and State after Constantine the Great, and severe laws were enacted under his successors against every departure from the established creed of the orthodox imperial Church. These laws passed from the Roman to the German Empire, and were in full force all over Europe at the time when Luther raised his protest. Dissenters had no rights which Catholics were bound to respect; even a sacred promise given to a heretic might be broken without sin, and was broken by the Emperor Sigismund in the case of Hus.†

---

*The Devil sometimes tells the truth. So Mephistopheles, in Goethe's *Faust*, when he excuses the aversion of the student to the study of jurisprudence, and says with a wicked purpose:

"Es erben sich Gesetz' und Rechte
Wie eine ew'ge Krankheit fort;
Sie schleppen von Geschlecht sich zum Geschlechte
Und schleichen sacht von Ort zu Ort.
Vernunft wird Unsinn, Wohlthat Plage;
Weh dir, dass du ein Enkel bist!
Vom Rechte, das mit uns geboren ist,
Von dem ist, leider! nie die Frage."

†Dr. (Bishop) Hefele discusses this case at length from the Roman Catholic standpoint, in his *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. VII. (1869), pp. 218 sqq. He defends Sigismund and the Council of Constance on the ground that a *salvus conductus* protects only against illegal violence, but not against the legal course of justice and deserved punishment, and that its validity for the return of Hus to Bohemia depended on his recantation. But no such condition was expressed in the letter of safe-conduct

This tyranny was brought to an end by the indomitable courage of Luther.

Liberty of conscience may, of course, be abused, like any other liberty, and may degenerate into heresy and licentiousness. The individual conscience and private judgment often do err, and they are more likely to err than a synod or council, which represents the combined wisdom of many. Luther himself was far from denying this fact, and stood open to correction and conviction by testimonies of Scripture and clear arguments. He heartily accepted all the doctrinal decisions of the first four œcumenical councils, and had the deepest respect for the Apostles' Creed on which his own Catechism is based. But he protested against the Council of Constance for condemning the opinions of Hus, which he thought were in accordance with the Scriptures. The Roman Church itself must admit the fallibility of Councils if the Vatican decree of papal infallibility is to stand; for more than one œcumenical council has denounced Pope Honorius as a heretic, and even Popes have confirmed the condemnation of their predecessor. Two conflicting infallibilities neutralize each other.*

Luther did not appeal to his conscience alone, but first and last to the Scripture as he understood it after the most earnest study. His conscience, as he said, was bound in the word of God, who cannot err. There, and there alone, he recognized infallibility. By recanting, he would have committed a grievous sin.

One man with the truth on his side is stronger than a majority in error, and will conquer in the end. Christ was right against the whole Jewish hierarchy, against Herod and Pilate, who conspired in condemning him to the cross. St. Paul was right against Judaism and heathenism combined, "*unus versus mundum;*" St. Athanasius, "the father of orthodoxy," was right

---

(as given by Hefele, p. 221), which grants Hus freedom to come, stay, and *return* (*transire, morare et redire libere*). Sigismund had expressly promised him "*ut salvus ad Bohemiam redirem*" (p. 226). Such a promise would have been quite unnecessary in case of his recantation.

*See my *Church Hist.*, vol. IV. 500 sqq.; and *Creeds of Christendom*, vol. I. 169 sqq.

against dominant Arianism; Galileo Galilei was right against the Inquisition and the common opinion of his age on the motion of the earth; Döllinger was right against the Vatican Council when, "as a Christian, as a theologian, as an historian, and as a citizen," he protested against the new dogma of the infallibility of the Pope.*

That Luther was right in refusing to recant, and that he uttered the will of Providence in bearing testimony to the supremacy of the word of God and the freedom of conscience, has been made manifest by the verdict of history.

---

*Döllinger's declaration of March 28, 1871, for which he was excommunicated, April 17, 1871, notwithstanding his eminent services to the Roman Catholic Church as her most learned historian, bears some resemblance to Luther's declaration at Worms. See Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, I. 195, sqq.

NOTE ON LUTHER'S SENTENCE: "HERE I STAND," ETC

These words of Luther have been reported again and again, not only in popular books, but in learned histories, without a doubt of their genuineness. They are engraven on his monument at Worms.

But this very fact called forth a critical investigation of the Saxon Archivarius, Dr. C. A. H. Burkhardt (author of the learned work: *Luther's Briefwechsel,*) *Ueber die Glaubwürdigkeit der Antwort Luthers: "Hie steh' ich, kann nicht anders, Gott helff mir, Amen,"* in the "Theol. Studien und Kritiken" for 1869, III. pp. 517–531. He rejects all but the last three words (not the *whole*, as Janssen incorrectly reports, in his History, II. 165, note). His view was accepted by Daniel Schenkel (1870), and W. Maurenbrecher (*Gesch. d. kath. Reform.*, 1880, I. 398). The latter calls the words even "improper and unworthy," because theatrical, which we cannot admit.

On the other hand, Professor Köstlin, the biographer of Luther, has come to the rescue of the whole sentence in his Easter-program: *Luther's Rede in Worms*, Halle, 1874; comp. his notes in the "Studien und Kritiken" for 1882, p. 551 sq., and his *Martin Luther*, I. 453, and the note, p. 800 sq. (second ed. 1883). His conclusion was accepted by Ranke in the sixth ed. of his Hist. of Germany (I. 336), and by Mönckeberg (pastor of St. Nicolai in Hamburg), who supports it by new proofs, in an essay, *Die Glaubwordigkeit des Lutherwortes in Wormz*, in the "Studien und Kritiken" for 1876, No. II. pp. 295–306.

The facts are these. In Luther's own Latin notes which he prepared, probably at Worms, for Spalatin, there is no such sentence except the

words, "God help me." The prayer which he offered loudly in his chamber on the evening before his second appearance before the Diet, and which some one has reported, concludes with the words, "*Gott helfe mir, Amen!*" (Walch, X. 1721; Erl.-Frkf. ed., LXIV. 289 sq.). Spalatin in his (defective) notes on the acts of the Diet, preserved at Weimar (*Gesammtarchiv, Reichtagsacten*, 1521(, and in his *Annals* (ed. by Cyprian, p. 41), vouches likewise only for the words "*Gott helfe mir, Amen!*" With this agrees the original edition of the *Acta Lutheri Wormatiæ habita* which were published immediately after the Diet (reprinted in the Frankf. ed. of the *Opera Lat.*, vol. VI. p. 16, see second foot-note).

But other contemporary reports give the whole sentence, though in different order of the words. See the comparative table of Burkhardt, *l. c.* pp. 525–529. A German report (reprinted in the Erl-Frkf. ed., vol. LXIV. p. 383) gives as the last words of Luther (in reply to Eck): "*Gott kumm mir zu Hilf! Amen. Da bin ich.*" The words "*Da bin ich*" (Here I am) are found also in another source. Mathesius reports the full sentence as coming from the lips of Luther in 1540. In a German contemporary print and on a fly-leaf in the University library of Heidelberg (according to Köstlin), the sentence appears in this order: "*Ich kann nicht anders; hier steh' ich; Gott helfe mir.*" In the first edition of Luther's Latin works, published 1546, the words appear in the present order: "*Hier steh' ich,*" etc. In this form they have passed into general currency.

Köstlin concludes that the only question is about the order of words, and whether they were spoken at the close of his main declaration, or a little afterwards at the close of the Diet. I have adopted the latter view, which agrees with the contemporary German report above quoted. Kolde, in his monograph on Luther at Worms (p. 60), agrees substantially with Köstlin, and says: "*Wir wissen nicht mehr, in welchem Zusammenhang diese Worte gesprochen worden sind, auch können sie vielleicht etwas anders gelautet haben; bei der herrschenden Unruhe hat der eine Berichterstatter den Ausspruch so, der andere ihn so verstanden; sicherlich drückten sie zu gleicher Zeit seine felsenfeste Uberzeugung von der Wahrheit seines in sich gewissen Glaubens aus, wie das Bewusstein, dass hier nur Gott helfen könne.*"

ARTICLE II.

PROBLEMS OF OLD TESTAMENT DISCUSSION.

By Prof. GEORGE H. SCHODDE, Ph. D., Capital University, Columbus, O.

A combination of causes have conspired during the past decade, or more, to make the Old Testament rather than the New, the chief arena of theological controversy. The irrepressible conflict of modern theology between supernaturalism on the one hand and rationalism on the other, in the wider sense of these words; or, in other words, of the principle that the religion and revelation of the Bible are divine in their origin and character, and, on the contrary, that these must and can be explained only as the resultants of natural and human agencies and factors—this conflict in our own day and date has been transferred into the department of Old Testament research. Accordingly the animated and ever bitter debate that has been carried on and is still being carried on, has an importance not only for the problems immediately involved, but is fundamental for Biblical science as such and for the faith and confessions of the Church. If radicalism can gain the day in the present Old Testament discussions, it has thereby virtually destroyed the foundations of the Christian faith and Church. For in the interpretation, or rather misinterpretation of the Old Testament it seeks to establish hypotheses concerning the origin, character, and development of the religion of the Hebrew Scriptures, which, if once accepted as correct, can in the New Testament also, and hence in the whole complex of Christian doctrine, analyze into nothingness all the divine elements of the Christian faith. If the naturalistic scheme of Graf, Wellhausen, Kuenen, and others, according to which they make the religion of the Old Testament a purely natural product and in no part or portion a revelation from a source higher than what is human, could not be refuted and shown to be in antagonism with well authenticated facts, then too the New Testament, which historically

and theologically, according to the clear statements of Christ and the New Testament writers, stands upon the foundation of the Old, would with its foundation crumble to pieces. It is this feature of general and fundamental importance that has awakened for the Old Testament discussions of our day such a wide spread interest among clear-seeing men even if they are not specialists in this field. These considerations make it plain why the Old rather than the New Testament is the cynosure of all eyes in the theological world.*

---

*It may be that this sentence requires some limitation. Just at present the critical discussions in the New Testament department are being revived and advanced views are being taken with more assurance than has been the case at any time since the Tübingen school of Baur and Strauss was compelled to retire before the counter-charge of conservative and orthodox scholars. In fact, comparing the New Testament literature of 1886 with that of the Old Testament, we must say that negative criticism has been more active in the former than in the latter. Whether this only happened to be the case in 1886, or indicates a turn in the debate, remains yet to be seen. Two new Introductions to the New Testament have appeared, one by Weiss, of Berlin, with some conservative results scarcely expected from so prominent a representative of mediating theology; another from Holtzmann, which has already reached a second edition, and which is so "advanced" that it has left truth out of sight altogether, making quite a *tabula rasa* of traditional views and accepting little as authentic in the New Testament except the famous four Pauline Epistles. The greatest stir in this field has been made by the History of Apostolic Times (*Das Apostolische Zeitalter der Christlichen Kirche*), by C. Weizäcker, the successor of Baur, in Tübingen. While not quite so radical as his predecessor, he reaches conclusions almost equally subversive of the truth of history and revelation. Holtsten, of Heidelberg, has published a new work on the synoptic gospels, with results that harmonize thoroughly with the old and refuted ideas of Baur. Does this mean a modern revival of the Tübingen criticism, just as the Wellhausen-Kuenen school is virtually a reproduction of the old and neglected views of George and Vatke? This note must not be understood as saying that the critics had not been at work on the New Testament also during the past few years. In fact, they have been hard at work, notably on the problem of the literary origin of the three gospels; but the discussions had been able to attract only the attention of the specialists, being overshadowed as far as the general public was concerned by the Old Testament problems. It may be that the two Testaments will divide the attention of the public.

In American circles also this controversy has attracted more attention than had been given to the contests of European critics heretofore. The ups and downs of advanced criticism in Europe had scarcely been even reported to the American public. It was not the Robertson Smith case alone that made this debate a burning question for America also, although this was the outward occasion for the outbreak of the controversy in our midst also. The theology of Germany has for decades back become a more and more potent factor in the formation of theological thought in America; nor has it always, or even generally been the best of German theology, older or modern, which has exercised this power. A large number of the younger American teachers of theology have been sitting at the feet of the famous professors in the German Universities, and brought over with them from the Fatherland both the good and the bad. While it is a matter of congratulation that so many young Americans seek the impetus and encouragement given them by the German schools, it is to deplored that so many go there unprepared and not sufficiently ripe in heart and mind to be able to prove all things and keep that which is good; nor do they as a rule, stay long enough to understand even the theological tendencies in Germany. It is to some extent owing to this that the Old Testament discussions in our midst have assumed a more or less crude and fragmentary shape. On the other hand, it must be stated that a great deal of the controversy against Old Testament criticism is born of ignorance and blind zeal. Especially does the religious press often consider it its privilege to condemn before it has gone to the trouble of examining into the merits of the cause it criticises. Then what has not been brought over from Germany by young students has been scattered by the translations of German works. It is true that the majority of these works represent either the confessional school or the more orthodox of the mediating theologians, yet the radical critics also have found translators and readers. These and similar causes have united to bring problems to our doors of which otherwise we might have only heard vague rumors. But as they are here, and have come to stay,

---

This is all the more probable as virtually the same problems are involved in both.

and are exerting a strong influence on the thought of the day and probably will exert a still stronger influence in the future, it is well for every intelligent Christian to secure as clear a view as possible of the questions involved, and thus be able intelligently and justly to take his position over against these problems and their real or pretended results. It is for this reason chiefly that we propose here to give a bird's eye view of the controversy, having in mind especially the needs of those who have not had the time or inclination to follow out the intricacies of the labryrinth of Old Testament criticism. The article is then not to be a new contribution to the solution of the problem, but merely a resumé of what has been done and what is further attempted.

In the nature of the case the Old Testament discussions will fall into three divisions, namely, lower criticism, higher criticism, and exegesis proper. The ultimate aim of all Biblical science is the interpretation of the Biblical text, the elucidation of the word of revelation, the drawing out of the truth which God has placed in the words spoken by the prophets and apostles. To do this three things are necessary; namely, first, we must have the exact words as they were spoken or written by the Biblical authors, and the process of attaining these is called lower or textual criticism; secondly, we must learn everything that can contribute to an understanding of this authentic text, *i. e.*, we must know, if possible, all about the author of a book, the time of its composition, the historical circumstances that surrounded its composition, its character and history as a literary work, &c., &c., and with this knowledge at our command seek to develop the meaning which the author under these surroundings had put into the text; which process is called higher, or sometimes, historical criticism; thirdly, the interpretation proper must then take place, which is called the exegesis of a passage or chapter or book. This natural division of the subject will give us the divisions for the discussion of the Old Testament problems, for they have not been confined to any one of the three or to any two of them.

The first point then is that of lower or textual criticism. All interpretation is bootless unless we have, as near as possible,

the *verba ipsissima* of the author under consideration. The object of exegesis being to extract the meaning of the words of another, the first prerequisite is to have these words in the form in which they were originally spoken or written. If any additions have been made by another hand, these must be cut out; if any omissions are found, they must be supplied, if possible; if any changes of any kind have been made in the text itself, these must, if possible, be rectified and the text restored to its original character. Classical philology has for centuries been engaged in this species of critical work. The acumen of the shrewdest minds has been devoted to the examination of the manuscripts of Homer, Zenophon, Thucydides, Cicero, Caesar, and other Latin and Greek authors, in order to restore to their original shape and form the literary remains of these classical writers. Out of the thousands of variants found in the different manuscripts, and with the aid of methodic and rational hermeneutical principles, critics have patiently labored on this text-critical work, with the result, that we undoubtedly have the texts of the authors in a more authentic and original form than the scholars of previous generations could boast of.

A similar method, only even more searchingly, has been applied to the New Testament text. In the scores of manuscripts of the Christian Scriptures the number of variants of all kinds found reaches, according to the excellent authority of Dr. Scrivener, the enormous sum of 150,000.* Of these, however, only about 400 materially affect the sense. The origin of these variants is not difficult to understand. We have none of the original copies of the New Testament books; the autographic copies of the evangelists and apostle have been lost. Our oldest manuscripts date probably from the fourth century, namely the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus. In copying and re-copying the New Testament writings, error after error naturally crept in, error of sight, of hearing, &c., &c. Tregelles classifies the variations as omissions, additions, and substitutions of words or phrases. For our purpose it will suffice to make note simply of the fact,

*Cf. on the whole subject of New Testament Textual criticism, Schaff's Companion to the Greek Testament. 1883, p. 171 sqq.

that these variants do exist, and hence of the necessity of textual criticism to pick out from among these 150,000 variants those readings which, from current principles of criticism, we have reason to believe to have been the original words of the writers. Simply taking the text of this or that manuscript and pronouncing it the *Textus Receptus* was easy enough in an age when men did not study these problems, and did not do their own thinking in regard to the New Testament text. But now the work is more difficult, and the efforts of Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort, show that a text fully acceptable to all has not yet been established, although the tendency toward agreement is greater than ever.

In regard to the Old Testament the problem stood and stands practically as it does in the New. The centuries between the autograph of the original writers and the earliest manuscripts in our possession are considerably more than they are between Matthew's day and the Vaticanus or Sinaiticus, and consequently the chances for errors to creep into the text through mistake or carelessness of copyists was all the greater, or at least would seem to be so. The facts in regard to the New Testament have plainly shown that although God has inspired the writers to pen the truth, he did not in a miraculous manner preserve the original form of these writings and protect them against the same fate which the writings of other ancient authors were subject to in the course of centuries. The same must be said to be the case in regard to the Old Testament. It, as little as the New, has been exempt from those vicissitudes to which all the writings of antiquity were heirs. We need not hesitate to say that in the present shape of the Old Testament there are corruptions in the text. The word "corruptions" sounds harsh, and seems to convey the idea of intentional change on the part of the copyist The technical meaning of the word in Biblical criticism is however of a more harmless nature. It simply means that there has been a change here or there from the original word or form as written or dictated by the original author. The Old Testament Canon closed about 400 B. C. (for we cannot accept the hypothesis of the origin of Daniel or of some of the Psalms in the Maccabean period), and our oldest Hebrew man-

uscripts date from the tenth, or earliest from the ninth Christian century. Accordingly there were thirteen or fourteen centuries between the original writing and the oldest copies of them in our possession. What was the fate of the text during these many years? It was copied again and again, undoubtedly hundreds, even thousands of times. If tens of thousands of variants could find their way into the New Testament in comparatively few centuries, did not a correspondingly greater number find their way into the Old Testament text in a period of perhaps three times its length and in a book three times the size of the New Testament? The probabilities are in favor of the affirmative to this question. That such corruptions did get into the text and that the Hebrew text as we have it now has its variants and consequently its errata, no honest student will doubt.* They actually do exist and it is suicidal to Christian scholarship to deny them, although we will say right here that as far as we have been willing to accept any as certain, they are even of less importance than the variants of the New Testament. But the expectations or fears that the Old Testament manuscripts will show up a larger number of variants than the New Testament MSS. did, are by no means realized. The existing manuscripts, on the contrary, show a remarkable agreement even down to minutiae, and the differences between them are few and insignificant. The voluminous comparisons of Hebrew manuscripts made by Kennicott in 1776–1780, who examined about 600 manuscripts and 40 of the old and more accurate printed texts,

*It will be impossible here to point out and illustrate the facts under this head. The student will find them easiest by reading carefully the historical books, especially Joshua and Samuel, as also Chronicles: Keil, the most conservative critic of the Old Testament in our day, in commenting on Josh. 8 : 13, acknowledges that there is a mistake here, as he does at a number of other places in the book of Joshua, and says (p. 86 of the English translation, note): "We need have no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that there is a mistake in the number given in verse 3, as the occurrence of such mistakes in the historical books is fully established by a comparison of the numbers given in the books of Samuel and Kings with those in the books of Chronicles, and is admitted by every commentator."

and of de Rossi, 1784–1788, who examined many others, showed that all existing manuscripts of the Hebrew Scriptures substantially agree in their readings, which of course does not exclude the fact that there were quite a number of unimportant variants. The natural conclusion from these premises would be that this state of affairs shows a remarkable care on the part of the Jews in preserving the integrity of their sacred books. This supposition would receive support from the well known fact that special students of the Scriptures formed a leading class in Israel as early as Christ's day, and that later at the various schools at Babylon, Tiberias, Janina, and elsewhere the very iotas and tittles of these writings were valued as gold, and the fruits of this minute study of the words of Scripture were laid down by these men, called Massoretes, in the Massora. So great is this agreement that even the so-called Codex Petropolitanus, published by Strock in 1876, which contains the so-called Babylonian punctuation, and represents a school of texts different from the ordinary Hebrew manuscripts, in the book of Ezekiel, according to the searching examination of Cornill, contains only sixteen real variants from the common Hahn edition of the Hebrew Bible.* This, however, is not the conclusion which more advanced investigators have drawn from these facts. Instead of accepting this as a proof of the superior character of our Hebrew manuscripts, they maintain that it is really a proof of their inferiority. The leading advocate of this thesis is Lagarde, one of the shrewdest scholars of this century. He says that "all our Hebrew manuscripts of the Old Testament are based upon one single copy [or prototype], whose very correction of mistakes in writing are faithfully copied as corrections, and whose imperfections they have adopted."† If this proposition is correct, then all our Hebrew manuscripts combined have for text-critical purposes the value of only a single manuscript. Lagarde's standpoint has been adopted by quite a number of scholars, Cornill going so far as to say that it is proved beyond a doubt. The proposition, however, is anything but proved; to

*Cf. Cornill, *Das Buch Ezechiel*, 1886, Prolegomena, p. 9.

†Cf. Lagarde, *Aumerkungen zur Griecheschen Uebersetzung der Proverbien*, 1863, p. 1 sq.

do this has never been attempted *in extenso* by any one. The character of the Hebrew manuscripts do not require such a strange, almost impossible theory, that they are all descendants from one parent manuscript from the days of the Emperor Hadrian, and the story which Lagarde unearthed out of an old Arabic Midrash of an archetypal copy from the siege of Bether, can scarcely be entitled to serious consideration. It would probably never have been brought forth from the tomb, if the substantial agreement of the Hebrew manuscripts were not such a disagreeable fact that it must be explained somehow without admitting the solidity and correctness of the Hebrew tradition of the text. The point *sub judice* is entirely too fundamental to admit of acceptance unless better substantiated than it is at present. But be this all as it may, the existence of certain corruptions in the Hebrew text is a fixed fact, and being a fact the textual criticism has its work to do for the Old as well as it has for the New Testament.*

Of course the next question in importance is as to the number and character of the corruption of the text. For we have an older Old Testament than the Hebrew, one that is itself at least thirteen hundred nearer to the close of the Old Testament canon and whose text is authenticated at least six hundred years earlier. We refer to the Septuagint, or Greek version of the Seventy. In many places the LXX. presents the same text as the Hebrew, as, *e. g.*, in the Pentateuch; in other places it deviates considerably, as, *e. g.*, in Daniel, Ezekiel, Job. The question accordingly arises which of the two is the better and more original text when they do not agree. The age of the LXX. as also the noteworthy fact that the New Testament throughout,

*That in the course of the centuries the Hebrew text did suffer changes of more or less importance, is acknowledged by the Massoretes themselves. When these literalists did their work on the Hebrew text, they found forms which they knew to be incorrect but which their reverence for the letter would not permit them to change. Accordingly they added the vowels of their corrections to the old consonants of the traditional text and added the consonants of their own suggestion and correction to the bottom of the page. Hence our *Q're and ktib.* The corrections of the Massoretes are, however, not always better than the traditional forms.

both Christ and the Apostles, quotes generally according to the Septuagint, and only exceptionally according to the Hebrew, *i. e.*, make a new translation from the Hebrew, would seem to indicate that the Septuagint as a whole has preserved the original text in its greater purity. It would however, be folly to jump to such a general conclusion. The Septuagint is a translation of very unequal merit, and then its exact character has not yet been settled, there being a number of recensions of it, and the original LXX. has not yet been restored. Accordingly nothing remains but to compare the separate passages of the LXX. with the Hebrew readings and then determine as soberly and cautiously as possible, which reading is critically the more correct, in case the two do not agree. It will be time enough to generalize when this patient but necessary work has been done. But taking facts as they are it is equally undeniable that in many places the Hebrew presents a better text than does the Greek, as also that in some places at least the Greek is better than the Hebrew. The first proposition will be readily yielded, and is proved by a mere reference to the translation of Job. The latter can be proved readily by a reference to the books of Samuel, though the superiority of the LXX. is claimed for others also. We can give here only one example to show how correct this proposition is. Between Joshua 15, 59 and 60, the Greek text inserts a fifth group of cities in Judah not found in the Hebrew text. This group embraces cities around Jerusalem, which are nearly all cities of importance, of fifteen of which the ruins have been found, and it is simply impossible that the writer of this catalogue should have omitted them from his lists. The omission in the Hebrew is readily explained, as the same word closes v. 59, and also the missing section, and the copyist took the latter for the former.*

The tendency now among text-critical scholars, especially in Germany, is to overestimate the literary and historical excellency of the Septuagint. This is wholly the cases in Lagarde, the *facile princeps* in this department, and his promising pupil, Cornill. The latter's critical edition of the text of Ezekiel,

*Cf. Keil, ad l.

published last year, is the only systematic attempt in late years on the larger scale, to put to practice what the text-critics have been preaching all along. He has done painstaking work, but he has so seriously modified the Hebrew text of the prophet, on the basis chiefly of the Greek, that he reduces the bulk of the text considerably. He has gone far beyond reasonable limits. A careful student of the O. T. text will take the Massoretic text as the basis, and if any changes are necessary, make them only when absolutely compelled to do so by the facts in the case. We have no doubt that when all the text-critical appliances that can justly be employed in the work have in a reasonable and correct manner been put to the Old Testament text, it will remain substantially the same as we have it now, although in many, possibly hundreds of cases, changes of lesser importance may be made. We are no prophet nor the son of a prophet, but it seems clear that Old Testament textual criticism will not demand such sacrifices as has New Testament textual criticism with its removal of the doxology in the Lord's Prayer, its rejection of the Trinity passage in St. John's Epistle, &c. In the nature of the case it cannot reach reliable conclusions of so radical a nature. Its work is more difficult than New Testament text criticism is. For it the MSS. are only of secondary importance, and the versions, the Septuagint, the Peshito, the Old Vulgate, the Targums, are the leading aids. It works with its own tools, and these are by no means as sharp as were those that cut off such chips in the New Testament text.*

As yet this whole discipline is in its infancy. This was clearly shown to be the case at least in America by the discussions following the appearance of the Revised Version of the Old Testament two years ago. Specialists and scholars in this department are not yet perfectly agreed as to the correct principles and the proper methods that should control these researches. The science is yet groping and in a tentative state. But lower criticism has a great work to do, to restore in every particular the *ipsissima verba* of the revealed word. For that

*The whole matter of Old Testament text criticism is discussed fully, ably, but from a somewhat radical standpoint, in the excellent *Prolegomena* to Cornill's Edition of Ezekiel.

reason even the most conservative of conservatives should encourage its efforts.

The next step in the critical process is to examine, in the light of all aids that can be brought to bear upon the subject, the text which lower or textual criticism has confirmed or corrected. This is called by that much misunderstood and maligned term of "higher criticism." The idea is often met with, that a higher critic is one who thinks himself endowed with higher acumen and wisdom than the ordinary man, by virtue of which he can analyze and argue the word of truth out of existence. No more foolish blunder could be made. Higher criticism consists simply in taking a Bible text, and focusing on it all the rays of light that a knowledge of the author, his time, the character of the composition, the historical background of the composition, in short, all the external and internal aids that can possibly be secured, and in the illumination thus secured to examine into the length, breadth and depth of a passage or book. It is the same literary process to which the classical student resorts if he would interpret his Homer or Cicero thoroughly. Higher criticism has been practiced by the Church from the beginning, and is practiced by all, and must be practiced, if exact and respectable Bible work is to be done. Never has there been a more sweeping piece of higher criticism seen than was practiced when the Church of the Reformation threw away, as being not a revelation of God, the Apocrypha of the Old Testament. Professor Greene, of Princeton, the most conservative Old Testament scholar in America, is as much a higher critic as are Professors Wellhausen and Kuenen. *Abusus non tolit usum*, and higher criticism, properly employed as the handmaid of faith, is one of the noblest of theological disciplines, as it arrives at the elucidation of the truth of God's revelation. It may have produced hay and stubble in abundance of late years, but it has also brought forth gold and silver. If neological and rationalistic theology has laid claim to a monopoly in this field, it is the duty of orthodox and conservative seekers for the truth to prove that they have not lawful claims to this. A fair and honest search for truth can only confirm it; if others have not been

fair in their researches, it is the duty of believing scholars to hold up their unfairness to merited rebuke.

The starting point and key-note of higher criticism in its modern phase, in so far as it is a subject of controversy, is the literary analysis of the Pentateuch. When in 1757 the Roman Catholic professor and physician Astruc published his hypothesis that the peculiar use made in Genesis of the words *Elohim and Jehova* for God indicated that Moses had used a number of literary documents in the composition of the book of Genesis, he set a little ball rolling that has now become a critical avalanche, covering the whole Old Testament. The discussion as to the literary analysis of Genesis, and then of the other books of Moses, and then of the Hexateuch, *i. e.*, the Pentateuch including Joshua, has been going on steadily ever since. In Germany and Holland, where men have been engaged in this work the most, a substantial unanimity of opinion has been reached. As far as we know of Professor Keil, in Leipzig (*not* connected with the University there) and Bachmann, of Rostock, are the only scholars who do not accept the documentary theory as a fixed result of the investigations of more than one hundred years. Many in England, as Driver, Robertson Smith and others, and some in America, as Briggs, Toy and others, also accept the analysis. With regard to the analysis itself there is also a somewhat remarkable agreement among scholars who occupy otherwise the most opposite position. Delitsch, Sr., of Leipzig, divides the Pentateuch into virtually the same elements that Kuenen accepts, although the former is a humble believer in the truth of revelation, the latter is a rabid rationalist. They believe with analysts in general, that the Hexateuch is composed of a Jehovistic document, combined with an Elohistic one, and found chiefly in the historical portion of Genesis and Exodus; then the famous Priest Codex, or Levitical work, containing the whole Levitical system, and found chiefly in the last chapters of Exodus, the whole of Leviticus, and the opening chapters of Numbers, but represented also in the historical records of Genesis and Exodus; then the legal portion of the book of Deuteronomy. All these elements were worked together and combined by an editor. Critics claim to be able to

distinguish in nearly every case to which source this or that chapter or verse is to be attributed. It is represented, that Hebrew historiography, differing from Indo-European, does not take the sources of information and work them up in the language of the author, but merely takes extracts from these sources and places them side by side in their original form, but seldom changing a form or word. In this way an historic mosaic is produced, the various blocks in which can easily be recognized. The question of an analysis of the Pentateuch is one of fundamental importance for an appreciation of the Old Testament problem of the day. In many circles it is considered as a tradition of criticism that no longer requires any proof. No one who has not examined the books of Moses word for word in the light of the claims offered by the analysts can form any idea of the plausibility of the argument advanced. For it would be silly to reject in advance the possibility of such an analysis as heterodox or not permissible. Even as the supposition that Moses wrote the whole Pentateuch as we have it now, it is still possible, and even probable, that in the composition of the Genesis he made use of older documents, which the inspiring spirit taught him how to utilize. Indeed the Pentateuch does quote at least one older book, the Book of the Just. Nor is it impossible that of these sources which Moses may have used, the one employed the name of Elohim for God and the other Jehovah. A sneering rejection of an Elohistic or Jehovistic writing is simply an indication of ignorance and prejudice The question is simply one of literary research. Do the facts as presented in Genesis, or in the other books of the Pentateuch, warrant the assumption that we have combined in them a number of older documents or sources? No doctrine of inspiration, however stringent or orthodox, can decide this question. The facts alone must do it. In regard to the books after Genesis the problem is somewhat different. It seems as though a rejection of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch could not be avoided if the documentary theory is accepted here. It is barely possible to unite the two, but it is hard work. But a question much discussed is whether the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, as this first expression in the latter books of the Old Testament

and in the words of Christ and of the New, really means that Moses is actually the writer of every word of the Pentateuch in the present shape and form of the books. There are many reverent students of God's word who claim that a fair exegesis does not hold out the affirmative; that Moses was indeed the great and original lawgiver, but that this does not exclude the possibility that God may later have given other laws which were added to the Mosaic code and formed one body with it. Whether the point is well taken or is merely a *Nothehelf* to give the analysts of the later books a Scriptural foothold is hard to say. If it is once clear that Christ really teaches that the lawgiver Moses is actually the literary author of the whole Pentateuch in its present shape, then the question is settled for every true Christian scholar. The Master has spoken and human wisdom must be silent. He is, if not a *doctor criticus*, at any rate a *doctor veritatis*. The natural interpretation of the New Testament would seem to bear out the position that He does teach the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch; hence the *onus probandi* is on the shoulders of those who deny this. It is recognized to be so too, at least silently by the fact that they are the party who consider it their duty to prove that they are in harmony with the New Testament. But the matter cannot be decided hastily. It takes patient scholarship and prayerful faith to come to a satisfactory conclusion; and he will be the slowest to condemn those opposed to him who is best acquainted with the facts in the case and feels the deepest interest in and reverence for the true authority of God's holy word. That the traditional view concerning the authorship or age of this or that book of the Bible must be correct, cannot be asserted *a priori*. The possibility of error must be admitted. The Church before the Reformation for more than one thousand years was fully convinced that the Apocrypha were the revealed words of God. The reformers showed by research and argument that this was not the case. In Galileo's day the standard interpretation of the day claimed that the Bible taught that the earth was the centre of the solar system. A renewed examination showed that the Bible made no such claim, and that current opinion was

in error. And thus too from the very outstart a general denial of every view in Isagogics differing from the traditional is neither reasonable nor just. Accordingly the claims of higher criticism in this regard is entitled to a respectful hearing. In whatever point they are wrong they can there be refuted.

But when the next step is taken and on the basis of an analysis of the Pentateuch, the attempt is made to reconstruct the history of Israel's religion and worship, the leading scholars are sorely divided against each other. They cannot agree as to the historic order and the age to which the various elements of composing the Pentateuch are to be assigned and hence not on the religious scheme of which they are the exponents, although other factors also than the mere analysis of the Pentateuch enter into the construction of this scheme. The great critical question is as to the age of the Priest-Codex, containing what may technically be called all the entire legal features of Mosaism. Up to a comparatively recent period, it was the general consensus of scholars that it was the oldest of the Pentateuchal documents, and that accordingly a developed Levitical system stood at the head of the theocratic development. Of late the leading advanced men in this line have turned this matter squarely around, and affirm that the Levitical system is the *latest* in the growth of religious thought in Israel, dating the Priest-Codex even as late as the exile or Ezra. The ostensible reason for this revolutionary procedure is the *argumentum ex silentio.* It is a well known fact that in the pre-exile age, even in the days of the high religious development under David and Solomon, the ideals of the Mosaic law were not realized, but that even men of God, like Samuel and David, and this too with the seeming approval of Jehovah, acted contrary to the clear and explicit commands of the Levitical law, as, *e. g.*, in their sacrifices. From this it is argued that this law could not have been in existence at the time of David or Samuel. The facts in the case are undeniable, but the logic is seriously at fault. An *argumentum ex silentio*, uncorroborated by other evidences, proves nothing. On the same line of proof we could argue that the Pharisees in Christ's day did not have the Old Testament and that the Romish Church in the sixteenth century did not possess the Bible,

as in both cases confession and life were notoriously in conflict with these books.

But the controlling factor in the construction of the new religious scheme is rather the philosophical idea of natural development. According to Kuenen's own statements, he recognizes in Christianity and Judaism, two very important religions, nothing less but also nothing more. In kind and essence they differ nothing from the religions of other people. Hence in origin, character and development the Old Testament religion is purely naturalistic, and in no wise the result of a revelation from God. When the facts of the Old Testament will not bend to this hypothesis, the critics break them. It would take a cyclopædia of a half dozen volumes to mention and criticise the methods, destructive of facts and of logic, by which such an hypothesis is made to agree with the Old Testament records. The records, by hook or crook, must fit into this philosphical Procrustean bed.

Over against this revolutionary reconstruction conservative scholars have been building on almost the same literary basis, *e. g.*, virtually the same readjustment of the records of the Old Testament books. Even Delitzsch accepts the Levitical code as the latest in the complex of the Pentateuchal law, but places it at a much earlier date. Others still insist upon the priority of this code to the others. The conservatives to a man acknowledge the divine element in the religion of the Old Testament and is the revelation of this religion, modifying their scheme of the growth of this religion by their attitude toward the Pentateuch problem. Not one though who has written on the subject of this religious growth, as far as we know, places the *whole* Mosaic law at the head of this religious development. In nearly every case the prophets are made the centre of this religious growth, both internally and historically, and the unfolding of the ideas of this religion placed in relation to this. Thus, to cite the latest conservative writer, Dr. Schultz, in Zöckler's *Handbuch der theol. Wissenschaften*, Vol. I. divides the Theology of the Old Testament (and naturally also its history) into the theology of the ante-prophetic period, of the prophetic period, and of the post-prophetic period. As for the positive religious contents of the Old Testament these conservative re-

productions do not stand behind the traditional expositions; indeed, at places, by readjusting a book to its correct historical surroundings they enable us to see in even more wonderful beauty and transparency the gracious plans of Jehovah. Many, possibly the most of American scholars will not agree with the critical standpoint of Brigg's Messianic Prophecy, yet no intelligent reader of that book will deny, that from his standpoint many an Old Testament passage receives a richer meaning than we had been accustomed to put into it.

While thus the Pentateuchal problem has been overshadowing all other Old Testament discussions, both for good and for evil, other riddles of scarcely less difficulty must be met by the student of higher Biblical criticism. We can barely mention them here, recalling to mind only the questions as to the author and age of Isaiah 40–66, of certain chapters in Isaiah, of the age of Joel, of the age and author of Daniel and the close of the Old Testament Canon, of the existence of Maccabean Psalms. All of these and many others have been and are yet being discussed. No doubt many dangerous views have been expressed and much harm done. But truth has also been the gainer. In the very nature of the case truth *must* eventually gain the victory, whatever be the seeming temporary defeats. Otherwise we would have to lose our faith in truth and in the God of truth as the controlling power in the history of his Church. *Magna est veritas et praevalebit.*

Of the third and final work of the Bible student, although the most important, we need say little or nothing here. In the exegesis of passages and books, the principles of the various schools that appeared antagonizing each other already in the preliminary work also appear. Commentaries from the stand points of the various schools have been and are being written, from the pronounced confessional and traditional standpoint on the one hand, to the outspoken rationalistic on the other, with many shades and shapes of compromising thought between. *Fas est ab hoste doceri,* and there can be no doubt that the controversies between the schools have improved our conservative commentaries also. But owing to the peculiar problems of the

hour many of these do not devote their strength so much to the unfolding of the thoughts of revelation, but rather to the preliminary literary and isogogical problems as also to outward features such as chronology, geography, &c., which are made the objects of attack by the destructive critics of the day. For this reason many of the older commentaries remain the best to our day for the explanation of the text itself. In this regard we do not think that Luther's Genesis has been surpassed (although he may put a little too much of the New Testament into the Old) nor Vitringa on Isaiah, nor perhaps Calvin's Commentaries on the historical books of the Old Testament. The literary activity in all these departments of Biblical research is being vigorously pushed, and a calm observer cannot fail to observe that the conservative tendencies are constantly gaining ground all along the line. When the struggle is over, there will be a substantial victory of truth to record, and a renewed vindication of the Bible as the word of revelation from God to man, given to teach him the way to salvation and eternal life.

ARTICLE III.

PROHIBITION.

By Rev. H. C. Haithcox, A. M., Ashland, O.

Does Prohibition prohibit? Yes—No! Such are the answers given by the living voice, by written and printed testimony, and by the facts of the case. Does God's law—"Thou shalt not bear false witness," "Thou shalt not steal," "Thou shalt not kill," "Thou shalt not commit adultery," "Thou shalt not covet"—prohibit? Yes—No! Yes, where the head and the heart, the religious and moral sentiments are right; no, where they are not right. In other words, where the religious sentiment is right God's prohibitory law prohibits, where it is not right it does not prohibit. It is just so with civil law. Where the sentiment toward government is right, the prohibitory law of government prohibits, and where the sentiment is wrong, it does not prohibit. Does Prohibition in Maine, in Kansas, in

Iowa, in Georgia, prohibit? Yes, where the sentiment concerning the law is right; no, where that sentiment is not right. This explains the contradictory voices we often hear, and those contradictory reports we read. Making due allowance for the color that may be given those answers by the wish that may beget and clothe the thought, prohibitory law from God and man depends for its effectiveness upon man's sentiment concerning it. Whatever the theory of law, whether it be human or divine, whether right or wrong, this is the stubborn fact that faces us. And in this country, in this government of the people, the law must have respect to the popular sentiment if it would not be a dead letter. Ordinarily a few persons cannot voice a law and make it effective unless it echo the voice of the people.

Now here is a law called Prohibition. Two or three States have adopted it. The many States have not. But in all the States there are citizens in favor of it. The question is, How many? Are the majority in favor of it? Whatever our opinion, we do not know. How find out? Until a majority are manifestly for it, it cannot become the law of the States. How get this majority? Or, if it already exist, how make it appear? If it does not exist, how create it? Thus the question of Prohibition, as before the people now, is a question of method rather than of right. The question of the right of Prohibition belongs to the past. Ever since the days of Chief Justice Taney, of Maryland, the right of Prohibition has been taught by the State. All legislation against the liquor traffic is prohibitory in character. I dare say we all believe in the principle of Prohibition—the prohibition of all wrong, against Cæsar or against God. "The law was added because of transgression." Why? To prohibit the transgressor from doing that which is hurtful to self or to another. Now the question is one of quantity and of method—how much Prohibition do we want? How get it?

Then, first, how much Prohibition do we want? There are two answers to this question. One is given from the stand-point of a prophet of God, the other from the stand-point of a prophet of the American people. The latter says: We want all the prohibition that will be for the public good. In our country the majority are the law-makers—the majority are the public. They

choose what they believe will be for the good of the public—themselves. Their prophet gets his inspiration from them, his constituents. He is their representative. He must study their wishes. He must keep his ears open to their voice. The people are the government, the supreme power, and he is their servant. For him as their prophet it is *vox populi vox Dei est.* He is to speak for the people, echo their voice. He is to study and interpret the people's will, and formulate such law as will express their will. This is why the politician must be all things to all men. The American politician is not a creator of sentiment. In the American idea of Government he cannot be. He is its creature, its servant. Hence, as an American citizen and prophet of the American people he says: Give me so much Prohibition as you, my people, want—as you believe will be for the public good. And we should be the last to demand him to say other than what his lord says. We, the people, are the master. And to his master he standeth or falleth.

The other answer is from the stand-point of the prophet of God. He speaks for God to the people. With him one with God is a majority. As God's prophet he is not democratic but theocratic. He does not look to the people for his message, nor ask what their sentiment is, to obey it, but to God whose command he is to obey. He cannot be a true prophet of God and hold back God's message to the people. God's sentiment, idea, word, is his law. He must talk for God, echo God's voice. Thus giving truth from God, he is an imparter of God's sentiment to the people, and an educator of that sentiment in their hearts and lives. He calls for all the Prohibition God manifestly calls for. As a true and faithful prophet he speaks as God speaks in his Word to him. God's law is his law. God's "thou shalt" and "thou shalt not" are his rules of conduct. God's idea of manhood is his idea of manhood. The Man Christ Jesus, God's ideal man for humanity, is the goal of his endeavor. So God's law in Christ he proclaims, to this mark of his high calling of God he points the people, and prohibits with a divine "thou shalt not" every thing that hinders man's movement toward this ideal. Here prohibition is most comprehensive, To be the ideal it must be so. Unto this the prophet of God must take

heed. But he cannot force the people to obey the law of this ideal. He cannot legislate them loyal to it. This is not his business. He is no law maker in this sense. He is a prophet, a voicer of God's law. He is to proclaim God's truth, the law of God's sentiment for and in humanity, and God will make his word as a fire in the hearts of the people. Then those who receive God's word he can lead toward God's ideal for them. Thus God's principle of Prohibition takes root in men's hearts and makes them loyal to God's government, the *imperium imperio.* Thus the leaven of the kingdom of heaven leavens the kingdom of the world. Thus the God sentiment gets into the human sentiment and works in men to will and to do of His good pleasure. And the hope of this world, this government of the people, is in the fact that God's kingdom of Truth and of Grace is in this world calling for the prohibition of all that hurts man. The prophet of God keeps God's voice echoing among men and in their consciences so the prophet of the people may catch up those echoes as the people's voice, and God reign in the hearts and governments of men.

Thus we see that these two prophets, the prophet of God and the prophet of the people, work along the same line. They start from different standpoints but come together for man's weal. They both look to the public good. One is of the people and for the people, the other is of God for the people. One, God's prophet, speaks to the conscience of the people as individuals, to keep the God consciousness of each one alive and forceful, so it will assert itself in righteousness among men and in government of men; the other speaks of the sentiments of men, so as to keep the *esprit du corps* strong enough to sustain the law which their representative may voice for the public good. Where that sentiment calls for Prohibition of evil their representative is to voice that sentiment in law. Thus the powers that be are ordained of God for good, and the prophet of the people and the prophet of God strike hands for the prohibition of hurt to the public good. Both are of God for the prohibition of wrong. Both seek the same end. But the prophet of God is the power behind the throne of Cæsar that makes for right-

eousness among the people, working most mightily, for the ideal kingdom in which all wrong shall be prohibited.

But how secure this consummation of all human and divine government? By the faithful co-working of the methods already indicated, the political and the religious. And by the political method is meant the method of the American citizen who says: "Politics is the science of government; that part of ethics which consists in the regulation of the government of a nation and state for the preservation of peace, prosperity, and safety; comprehending the defense of its existence, the increase of its strength and resources, the protection of its citizens in their rights, together with the preservation and improvement of their morals, by working out into objective law the best sentiments of the people." Such is the idea and aim of the true politician, the patriotic and philanthropic prophet of the people. As such he is an American citizen, keeping his hand on the American pulse, seeking to report promptly and correctly the symptoms, and be ready to advise as to the remedy best adapted to the case in hand, the law that the moral vitality will sustain and grow stronger thereby. He looks for and discovers the tone of social life, the sentiment of the body politic, and tries to properly represent that and sustain it in all its functions in the government of the American people. Hence he is careful to prohibit what that sentiment will prohibit for the people's good. He is careful to avoid expressing an idea or voicing a law which the life of the body politic will not sustain. He knows that in a government of the people a small minority cannot have its idea prevail at once, even though that idea be a good one and better for the people than the choice of the majority. To voice the idea of the minority as law would be subversive of law, for the sentiment of the people would not sustain it. It would be practically a dead letter. That is what is the matter with the prohibitory law in some cities of prohibition States. It is too far in advance of the public sentiment. The moral force behind the law is too weak. Less prohibition would be more effective in such places and foster a better respect for law. Therefore the American politician, the prophet of the people, is careful to point

a law that will voice the sentiment of his people and foster respect for popular government.

Right here some of us are not as loyal to our American government as we should be to be consistent Americans. Because we cannot have our sentiment voiced as law and read it "total prohibition of the liquor traffic as a beverage," we propose to have nothing to do with any law that says "partial prohibition" as the voice of the people. Yea, worse: I have heard men and women denounce and do all they could against such a law, because it did not voice their sentiment. Yet they were not a tithe of the majority. Thus they encouraged rebellion against their body politic, against the American principle that the voice of the majority makes law. Thus by example they provoke and encourage the liquor party to be lawless, foster offensive partisanship which makes blind to the principle of our government, the public good. Such a spirit was not that of the great Paul who taught obedience to powers far from expressing his idea of what a government ought to be. A poor law is better than no law. Even a Caesar's government is better than anarchy. Our Lord said of such a government, Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's. Our American Caesar is a much better Caesar than that old Roman who put Christ to the cross. Let us render to the sentiment of this people that which is due unto it, and do it no violence nor sow the seeds of revolution in American soil. It is better to hold to the fundamental principle of our government if the progress does seem slow. It will be surer. It will make the prophet of the people more careful and the people themselves more cautious. The public good will be the better served and the prohibition of all intemperance more speedily secured.

The other method is religious. Here the Church, with the word of her Lord in her heart and on her tongue, is the reserve of moral force in the social body. She is the light of the world, the salt of the earth, the ten righteous that save the city. So saith her Lord who lighteth every man that cometh into the world. Through the Church the Lord imparteth light and life to the world, tones up the moral sentiment, and makes conscience tell for righteousness. How? By sending forth his

prophets to preach his word. The minister of the word of God is not of the people, but for the people; not of the times, but for the times; he speaks not by the authority of man, but by the authority of God. He is elected, not to represent the people, not to voice their sentiment, but to represent God and voice his sentiment. Therefore the necessity of his being faithful to God, and unflinchingly firm in the delivery of God's message to the people. He must not let the world reform him nor prohibit his message from God. The world needs reforming. God sent him to be the reformer of the world by so echoing his voice as to accomplish the work. He can do this best by keeping to his work—not by becoming a prophet of the people, but by fidelity as a prophet of God. Thus he is the power behind the throne of Caesar. Thus he is, like his master, the Christ, about his Father's business. Thus the world will be reformed most successfully by the leavening power of the Gospel.

Here we need to be cautious. Our zeal is in danger of running away with us, and of causing us to voice our sentiment, our idea, in the body politic as a law for that body. The Church is not to legislate for the State. Nor is a part of it or one individual of it to do so. History has shown that when the Church took up the sword to point a moral she made blood flow to enforce her law. Then she erred from the spirit and example of her Lord, who said: "Put up thy sword," "my kingdom is not of this world." The Church must keep to her sphere in matters of State. God's prophet must not become a Mahomet, nor a prophet of the people, lest they reach for the sword to enforce their sentiments and lose their hold on the power that works righteousness and peace among men. They accomplish more by laying God's word on the people's hearts to enlighten conscience and tone up the morals of the people. Get God's living word into the hearts of the people and the people will say to their prophets: We must have better laws and better morals. If the law of God, as written by Moses and illustrated in life by Christ, be faithfully given to the people, it will so reinforce the divine immanence in man, so intone conscience, so inwork righteousness, as to press hard forward and point straight toward God's ideal for humanity. There will then be an increasing of

divine power in the hearts of the people, and as the people so moved work out the inwrought righteousness from God, they will make better laws and prohibit more and more that which is hurtful to man. God's prophets can afford to so labor and to await results. This method leaves men unshackled by legalism and free to think and act out their sentiments. It leaves the people to struggle with the truth of God rather than with men or their opinions. It brings principles to the front. It disarms prejudices. It gives more room for the truth to throb in the heart and make itself felt. It presses responsibility home to the people, making them feel that God is near them and they must act as in His sight. This will give a freer and better expression of God's will in the body politic, the people. The prophet of God and the prophet of the people will speak more nearly the same thing. Then Prohibition will not be a party measure, but a victorious sentiment of the people. And that means that Prohibition will prohibit, the inwrought conviction from God will be triumphant in the hearts of the people, in the law of the land as voiced by their representatives, and the prophet of God will say amen.

ARTICLE IV.

IN WHAT DOES THE UNIVERSAL PRIESTHOOD OF BELIEVERS CONSIST?

A translation from Luthardt's *Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, by REV. W. H. LEWARS, Lititz, Pa.

That a priestly office belongs to the Christian the scriptures abundantly teach. For example, Gen. 19 : 6; Rev. 1 : 6, 5 : 10; 1 Peter 2 : 5–9. But the more important question is concerning the duties involved therein. Relative to the duties of the priesthood in general the Old Testament formula gives us more accurate and specific directions, and these we desire to utilize in unfolding the characteristics of the New Testament Priesthood. This is admissible, for if it is a fact, that both the Old and the New Testaments are pervaded by a divine plan of salvation, which has for its object the restoration of man's fellowship with

God, the conditions for the reception and development of this plan must remain essentially the same. Only the external form may in some respects vary in accordance with a given stage of development and the greater or less degree of knowledge which is conditioned thereby. We will therefore direct our attention first to the Old Testament Priesthood.

According to Ex. 19 : 6 all the people were to be partakers of the priestly office, but they were not as yet prepared to receive it, in consequence of which God chose from among the mass individuals, under whose mediation, teaching and example, the people were to be brought into fellowship with Him and educated to a correct comprehension of their calling. This is the significance of the Old Testament Priesthood. But in addition to this there was in every sacrifice a certain voluntary act incumbent upon him for whom the sacrifice was made, which manifested itself in placing his hand upon the head of the sacrificial victim. Lev. 4 : 4; 1 : 4, 5; 3 : 2. The same act was required in killing the victim, especially at the paschal sacrifice, Ex. 12. The question now arises—what demands does the Old Testament attach to the vocation of its priests. They are two fold, being first of a general and secondly of a special nature. The Old Testament Priesthood could be recruited only from the tribe of Levi, which indicated the absence of the influence of the human will and an evidence of divine appointment. The residences of the priests were scattered throughout the land in thirteen different cities of the Levites. This was symbolical of the priesthood of the whole people. Their principal duty is defined in their name: כהן to stand—viz. in the capacity of servants before Jehovah as representatives of the people. Therefore being called to effect the reconciliation of the people with God and to offer up sacrifices, they themselves were above all things expected to be holy. For this reason they were commanded, prior to any official act, to seek personal atonement and to purify themselves. (Lev. 16 : 4, 11). As a sign of their purity they officiated in white robes (Ex. 28 : 39), and as a matter of course they must be free from bodily defects (Lev. 21 : 17). Not only were these conditions required of them while they were engaged

in the sacrificial service; but they were strictly commanded to separate themselves in their every-day life from everything that might defile them or in any way prove a hindrance to their service in the Most Holy things. (Lev. 21 : 1, f.). Being thus debarred from engaging in secular pursuits, they received their support from the people, which consisted in the first fruits, the voluntary and involuntary gifts, a portion of the sacrifices, the Levitical tithes and the like, (Numb. 18 : 26; Neh. 10 : 37). This service of the Lord requires separation from everything earthly and unclean, and an unconditional consecration.

The priestly calling in a more limited sense demanded the presentation of various sacrifices. By sacrifice in the most general signification is meant a gift and it is the expression of a loving surrender to God, who is the giver of all good.

Such sacrifices must be offered as long as God bestows his gifts upon individuals who acknowledge him. But in the case of man in his sinful state their scope must of necessity enlarge itself; for he could no longer present divinely acceptable offerings. According to the will of God therefore the requisite fitness for this must first be restored by presenting a vicarious sacrifice marked by blood, Gen. 3 : 21, Lev. 17 : 11, compare Rom. 6 : 23, Heb. 9 : 22. The character of the sacrifices was therefore of a twofold nature: first that of atonement חטאה, sin-offering, second עלה burnt-offering, to which were joined שלם peace-offerings and thank-offering, and מנחה bloodless offering of good works in a variety of forms. The totality of these offerings serves as a mirror of the fulfilment of the desire for communion with God on the part of a sinful race. We are however not to understand that the whole of these offerings were demanded in every case; but they were admissible.

Many offerings—for instance the bloodless and the thank offerings, could not be made without a previous expiation. The progress of this routine of offerings was as follows, (the process of the individual offering has here no significance). The principal part of the *sacrificium*, that which lies at the foundation of everything else, is the sin-offering. Its design is to make expiation for a certain special sinful act of the defiled sinner.

The victim suffers death for him. The sprinkling of its blood upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offerings (Lev. 16 : 18–19), upon the altar of incense (Lev. 4 : 7), upon the veil of the sanctuary (v. 6), or even upon the holy of holies before the mercy seat (Lev. 16 : 14, 15) appeaseth the wrath of Jehovah (Lev. 16 : 16). The flesh in common with the fat was taken outside of the camp to be burned, the person burning it being required to cleanse himself afterwards (Lev. 16 : 28). Through this shedding and offering of the blood which contained the life (Deut. 12 : 23) atonement was effected for the sin of the offerer.

But by this act the restoration of communion with God was not yet fully accomplished. To it must be added the burnt-offering. As a bloody offering this also had an atoning significance, not so much for individual sins as for general depravity (Lev. 1 : 4, 5; 14 : 20; 17 : 11). It had a still further object. The real characteristic of עלה comprises the entire burning of the offering, and hence signifies the entire consecration of the individual to God.

It symbolizes the divinely desired relation of the individual as well as all the people to Jehovah. It must appear with every sacrificial act; it was presented every morning and evening and must even continue to burn throughout the night (Lev. 6 : 2). Thus after the expiation of the individual sin as well as that of general depravity the union between man and God was brought about through the consecration of the entire person.

But the full communion with God demanded a visible expression in which it must prove and manifest itself. This was given in the thank offerings. זבח, שלם and מנחה (Lev. 3 : 1). They represented besides the subordinate significance of reconciliation, above all the idea of the gift. It was presented as a token of gratitude for the exceeding great favor of restored communion or in view of favors yet to be received—in the latter instance it was an expression of believing prayer (Ps. 56 : 13, 14; 54 : 8). The thank-offering takes up again the former two sacrifices. The sin-offering in its shedding of blood; and the burnt-offering, with its personal consecration, by the partial consumption (of the fat) and adds

to this union thus concluded the external act of thanksgiving as a visible expression of the existing communion. These acts being performed the response on the part of God cannot fail. He also gives evidence of it, on his part, and invites man to his feast. This is the climax in sacrificial service and it occurs in all the greater offerings—such as the passover and the consecration of the priests (Ex. 29 : 32. Lev. 6 : 17).

After the fellowship between God and man was in this way established it devolved upon man (for God is faithful) to continue in this relation. This idea was expressed by the bloodless offerings (מנחה) Ps. 40. They are symbols of a steadfast continuance in communion with God, and it is obvious that they could be united only with burnt and thank-offerings. They consisted in the presentation of bread and wine as examples of the noblest products of the land and as an evidence of faithful labor, without leaven or honey, the symbols of uncleanness and fleshly lusts (Lev. 2 : 11) seasoned with the salt which represented the indestructible nature of the covenant, anointed with the oil of the Holy Spirit and accompanied with the incense of prayer (Lev. 2 : 15, Ps. 141 : 2). These meat- and drink-offerings were likewise to be continually offered and were combined with the daily burnt-offerings, morning and evening (Num. 28 : 2).

The Passover stood outside the sphere of divine worship and for this very reason it was of the highest significance, (Ex. 2 : 12). Having been instituted before any of the sacrifices it was to be a symbol of the true and peculiar relation of Israel to Jehovah. In it the universal priesthood is brought to its highest realization inasmuch as the father of every family was to present the offering. In it are comprehended all the other offerings: in the shedding of blood the sin-offering was represented; (v. 7) in the roasting of the meat consecration was signified; in the social feast the actual communion with God is symbolized. Furthermore unleavened bread and bitter herbs were ordained to be used. For the people in general the idea of communion regarding atonement was consummated in the sacrifice on the great day of atonement, (Lev. 16); with regard to full consecration, in the daily burnt-offerings and the meat and drink-offerings connected therewith. Further in the presentation of the shew-bred the

importance of actual and continued communion with God found expression in good works.

But all these offerings so far as the personal relation to God is concerned are without significance or effect unless the external act is reflected within the soul of the offerer. The *opus operatum* neither bestowed nor promised anything. (1 Sam. 15 : 22; Isa. 1 : 11; Jer. 6 : 20; Hos. 6 : 6; Mal. 1 : 11). The disposition of the heart must be the *causa movens* as it also was the *causa efficiens*. For this reason prayer became the substitute for sacrifice, after the destruction of the temple.

The aggregate of the duties and demands incumbent upon the priests is herewith brought to view. They consisted in avoiding all transactions involving defilement and pollution, or in making a bloody atonement for them. Also, in cutting loose from all that was secular or that alienated from God, and in the full consecration to him and his service as well as in the grateful realization of his fellowship.

It behooved this idea of the universal spiritual priesthood, being as yet veiled, to continually manifest itself more and more clearly along with the growing knowledge of God and salvation, and that too primarily in its more spiritual phase. It was all the more necessary that it should be gradually set forth inasmuch as the externalization of worship, the other extreme, a dead work-righteousness, endeavored to assert itself as the real essence. To reveal the spiritual significance of the priesthood was an important part of the work of the prophets. "Rend your hearts and not your garments" was the ever recurring theme of their rebukes.

"I desired mercy and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings" (Hos. 6 : 6; Joel 2 : 13) was the keynote of their preaching, In proportion as this was realized men became convinced of the insufficiency of the mediation brought about by offering beasts. Not every sin could at all times be atoned for (those committed, בשגגה Num. 15 : 24, 30). In the involuntary act of the substitute and in the insufficiency of its value, the offering of beasts proves inadequate to pacify the

soul conscious of guilt. (The oft-repeated ceremonies already indicate this). During the captivity of the people of God they were deprived of the privilege of sacrificing and could not present external offerings. An act of divine educational wisdom can here be manifestly recognized. The temporary exile was intended to wean the people from their faith in the perfection of an outward service, and to lead them to the acknowledgment of the necessity of a spiritual service. As early as the days of Zecharias the people were capable of understanding the divine Word: "In that day there shall be a fountain opened in the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin and uncleanness." Zech. 13 : 1.

Then, after the idea of the spirituality of the priesthood and sacrifices had become clearer, it seemed possible by emphasizing the other side of it, that is the universality, to lead the people to a full recognition of the essence of the priesthood. This point of view was represented by Phariseeism. Its purpose was to make the external holiness of the priesthood the common property of all. Even its name is an expression of this—signifying separation, that is, from everything Levitically unclean. To attain this a knowledge of the law must be diffused and this was to be accomplished by the synagogue.

The entire life of the people was regulated from the religious standpoint, even to the minutest features and most particular details. This was to serve as the rock on which man might be saved, and upon which it was hoped that they might build yet further. But in this endeavor to obtain the universality of the priesthood by means of petty painstaking, the development or at least the maintenance, of its spiritual side was forgotten. When, therefore, redemption came with its spiritual demands this sect must find itself disqualified in its outward as well as its internal attitude.

Redemption came. Jesus Christ embodying at once both priest and sacrifice (Heb. 8 : 3; 9 : 12–14)—a priest holy and exalted—one who carried the קדש יהוה "on his forehead and in his heart" (Ex. 28 : 36; Heb. 7 : 26)—a sacrifice without spot or blemish, (Heb. 7 : 26; 9 : 14)—rendering voluntarily (Gal. 1 : 4) and freely (Eph. 5 : 2; Heb. 9 : 26) a passive

(Rom. 3 : 25; 5 : 6–10; John 1 : 29) and an active obedience (Rom. 5 : 19)—in full surrender to God (Matt. 20 : 28)—in his person representing every shade of the theanthropic fellowship, (John 1 : 14; 1 Tim. 3 : 16)—the yea and amen of all sacrifices, (2 Cor. 1 : 20) perfecting all offerings in one, (Heb. 10 : 12–14) so that no more offerings of flesh need be brought (Heb. 10), poured out his Spirit upon all flesh, enabling us to present ourselves in truth to God and to worship him in spirit and in truth (John 4 : 24) everywhere without fleshly mediation, "whether in Jerusalem or Gerizim," and in his most holy sacrament has rendered possible our real communion with God (1 Cor. 10 : 16).

It is therefore impossible after the death of Jesus Christ to present further external offerings, and the priestly functions of man must therefore be transformed in harmony with this fact. Since even in the old covenant only that offering was effectual which was accompanied by a corresponding state of mind, the spiritual element being to a certain extent the principal thing, so after the cessation of outward sacrifices the disposition of the heart constitutes its essence; and inasmuch as those external offerings are only done away with in the offering of Christ, this state of mind must likewise be joined with the sacrifice of Christ. The New Testament Christian is accordingly obliged to personally appropriate the sacrificial death of Christ. In it alone can he be assured of expiation and reconciliation with God—by this alone is he enabled to surrender himself to God, and by this alone finally to attain to union with Him. He no more presents external offerings, but, in a word, *himself* in Christ. It is self-evident that this cannot be done by a third person, but by him alone. This by no means implies cessation or destruction of the Old Testament sacrificial service, but its continuous fulfilment. Under the new covenant the Old Testament Priesthood must accordingly pass away and the one which comes into existence, must be a spiritual one.

But Christ was not only the fulfilment of all sacrifices, but also of the priesthood which brought them. He was the holy, sinless priest who need not first offer for himself (Heb. 7 : 26, 27; 1 Peter 1 : 18; 2 : 22); but was the one only High Priest, outside of whom no other mediator between God and man can appear.

(1 Tim. 2 : 5, 6). Upon these grounds the institution of the Old Testament priesthood vanished in the new covenant; but not so fully that it was entirely abolished and was no longer necessary to the Christian. He still has need of it as much as before, not however in an external manner, but Christ is still continually exercising his priestly functions (1 John 2 : 1; Heb. 7 : 25). Only in and through him can the believer present divinely acceptable offerings. This likewise can of course not be done by a third person. For this reason and because of the spiritual character of the offerings, the New Testament priesthood must be a universal one.

In the New Testament priesthood accordingly the two constituent elements, spirituality and universality, are united, but in the New Testament priest, the priest and the sacrifice are one and its fundamental idea, according to this, is that holy individuals can, through Christ, present themselves as acceptable offerings unto their God.

The New Testament priesthood has therefore the same functions as that of the old, differing only in the degree of fulfilment. The offerings of the Old Testament were sin and burnt-offerings of which latter the thank-offering was only a sub-division, corresponding to the relation which consecration to God and the presentation of gifts to Him bear to each other. The sacrifice of Christ involved likewise pre-eminently the significance of expiation and consecration. Inasmuch then as the idea of the New Testament priesthood is the reference of the offering on the part of the offerer to himself and to Christ; its duties must be of a doubly two-fold character.

I. The objective appropriation of the sacrifice of Christ. (a) In expiation. (b) In entire consecration.

II. The subjective presentation of this offering itself in two aspects. (a) In expiation. (b) In personal consecration.

I. The appropriation of Christ's sacrifice. (a) In respect to his work of expiation. Our salvation is accomplished through the death of Christ (Heb. 9 : 12–15). This offering the believer must appropriate unto himself through the agency of faith. Through faith he becomes a partaker of the atoning sacrifice of Christ in that he possesses the full assurance that Christ died for

him, (Rom. 5 : 10; Heb. 2 : 9–11; 1 Peter 1 : 19; 1 John 1 : 7; Gal. 2 : 16; especially Rom. 3 : 24, 25, and Col. 1 : 21–23). Through the acceptance of this death on our part we are regarded as having suffered the penalty of the law and accomplished expiation, (2 Cor. 5 : 14; Rom. 6; Gal. 2 : 20). Thus the believer is viewed as one for whom propititiation has been made.

(b). In respect to his full consecration, faith lays claim to the perfect, self-surrendering obedience of Christ, so that the individual is viewed as one who has kept the law and fulfilled the will of God. (Rom. 8 : 3, 4; Matt. 5 : 17; Heb. 5 : 8, 9; Gal. 3 : 13; Phil. 3 : 8, 9). Through the mercy of God therefore the righteousness and obedience of Christ are imparted, that is, appropriated to us on the ground of faith.

II. The second duty of the New-Testament priest consists in the subjective offering of himself. For the believer cannot appropriate to himself Christ's blood and righteousness, unless he has first freed himself of his own righteousness and sinfulness.

Here again two sides present themselves.

(a). That of *expiation.* The primary idea of the appropriation of the sacrifice of Christ presupposes an act on the part of man. The offering in the case of the latter is a real one—the Ego itself is slain. The Scriptures designate it "old man, original sin, the flesh, &c." This old Adam with his sins and sinful lusts, must die (Rom. 6 : 6; 5 : 6; Gal. 2 : 19, 20; 5 : 24; Col. 2 : 20; 3 : 5; 1 Pet. 2 : 24). This takes place in true penitence. Repentance and faith are the fixed conditions upon which we enter into the kingdom of heaven (Mark 1 : 15). Through these means we obtain remission of sins (Mark 1 : 4; Luke 24 : 47; Acts 3 : 19) and with that everlasting life (Acts 11 : 18). A new man must therefore appear, living in righteousness and holiness to God. This is the other side, (b). that of *personal consecration.* The individual presents himself to God as a sacrifice in all his acting and thinking, (1 Pet. 2 : 5; Rom. 12 : 1, 6 : 13). All his thoughts are directed upon God, his dispositions and desires move towards him only, and hence he loves God with all his heart and with all his soul, (Deut. 6 : 5; Matt. 22 : 37; 1 Tim. 1 : 5). All his powers and gifts he is to bring

into the service of his Lord—his will he is to subject to him (1 Sam. 15 : 22; Matt. 26 : 29; 6 : 10) willingly to suffer (Phil. 2 : 17, 18; 2 Tim. 4 : 6) in short wholly to merge his will into that of God.

Thus the believer fulfils the burnt-offering of personal consecration to God in body and spirit. But this can not be done without an expression of good works towards God and his neighbor. These are the New Testament thank-offerings. They consist in praise and thanksgiving towards God, in acknowledgment of his gifts and in active love towards our neighbor. They can be offered with heart, word and deed (Heb. 13 : 15; Ps. 69 : 31, 32; 50 : 14). Out of the heart proceed no more evil thoughts (Matt. 15 : 19) but the fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, &c. (Gal. 5 : 22; Eph. 5 : 9). But whenever the heart is full, the hand cannot remain empty (Heb. 13 : 16; Matt. 25 : 40). Here belong all the various deeds of mercy which had their type in the sacrificial (love) feasts of the Old Testament, also the offering of intercession, as Christ has plead and is still pleading for others (1 Tim. 2 : 1), and the bestowal of blessing (1 Pet. 3 : 9). Such good works are not the result of a resolution on the part of the believer on the occasion of every new opportunity offered, but they rather flow spontaneously from the renewed heart upon every new opportunity (John 7 : 38).

As all the sacrifices in the old covenant found their culmination in the feast of the passover so the sacrifices under the new covenant culminate in the Lord's Supper. In it we celebrate the memory of Christ's death, (Luke 22 : 19; 1 Cor. 11 : 25, 26); and therefore renew in it the significance of his sacrifice for us. The reconciliation which Christ devised once and for ever, that is, forgiveness of sin (Matt. 26 : 28; Heb. 9 : 12), man appropriates unto himself through faith in his blood (Rom. 3 : 25). Through self-examination in sorrow and repentance (1 Cor. 11 : 28) the individual dies according to the old man, and a new man arises in faith, who grasps the merits and righteousness of Christ and in them offers himself wholly to the service of God (1 Peter 1 : 14, 15; Eph. 5 : 1, 2), actualizes this consecration through the thank-offerings of his gifts (*oblationes*) and finds

living communion with God in partaking of this thank-offering, with which is connected the flesh and blood of Christ (1 Cor. 10 : 16). In conclusion, gathering together the threads of our argument we find this result, that the Universal Priesthood of Believers, as taught by the Scriptures, consists, in crucifying the old man through sorrow and repentance, in exercising faith in the gospel of Christ and the grace recovered through him, in apprehending the righteousness of Christ that we may become the children of God through regeneration by the Holy Ghost, in consecrating soul and body to the service of God, and offering unto Him acceptable praise and thank-offerings in heart, word and deed, pure and holy unto Him.

ARTICLE V.

PREMATURE LICENSURE.

By Rev. Matthias Sheeleigh, D. D., Fort Washington, Pa.

"Lay hands suddenly on no man."—St. Paul.

The Licensing of candidates for the ministry has occasionally, within recent years, come up amongst us as a subject of inquiry, in some of its phases. There are those who have even held that licensing previous to ordaining should be entirely abolished. This has been done in some quarters. But it is not this view to which attention is herein respectfully invited. The question shall not now be whether licensing is in itself the most proper and expedient method or not; but whether, if retained, it may not be practiced with undesirable haste.

The following presentation of the subject was prepared, on appointment, for the opening of a discussion in the Philadelphia Conference of the Synod of East Pennsylvania, and read on the 8th of last February:

The question on our programme reads thus: "Should the Preamble and Resolutions, 'On Admitting to Licensure,' (Minutes of Synod, 1885, page 38,) be adopted by Synod? Referred to Conferences for discussion, (Minutes, 1886, page 33)."

The Preamble and Resolutions are in this language:

"WHEREAS, This Synod, having for a number of years given trial to a method of admitting young men to the ministry of the gospel one year before completing their course of preparation in theological studies, and having now arrived at the conviction that the method involves inconsistencies and disadvantages; therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That two years hence, and thereafter, the Synod of East Pennsylvania will require in candidates for the ministry such qualifications as may be considered needful for immediate entrance into the pastoral service, instead of investing with ministerial authority in view of prospective completion of preparation.

"*Resolved*, That, for the sake of uniformity, we invite all sister Synods, that have been practicing on the principle referred to in the foregoing preamble, to adopt the same rule as set forth in the accompanying resolution."

The secretary made record concerning the preamble and resolutions, that they "were read before Synod, (at Ashland, in 1885); and, by suggestion of the mover, on motion they were laid over to the next annual meeting for action, in order to give those interested time to consider the matter and vote intelligently on the subject."

At the following meeting of the Synod, held at Reading, September, 1886, the subject was regularly called up, as business pending from the former year. Owing, apparently, to a pressure of work, it was "*Resolved*, That action be deferred for one year, and that the subject be taken up for discussion by the Conferences."

The question comes, therefore, before us to-day for two reasons: it is in itself worthy of our thought and time, and the Synod refers it to us for examination, with the view of facilitating proper action by that body. It seems, moreover, well that final determination should not be long delayed.

1. The rule in question should be abolished, on the ground of its *inconsistency*. It departs from the true idea of licensing.

The *old* license system has been generally understood amongst us as meaning the conferring of full ministerial powers on a candidate, the only material limitation relating to time—one year being named as the term of given authority. At the end of this period the paper could be renewed, or the candidate admitted to ordination, a more solemn form of induction into the sacred

office, making the investment with ministerial powers permanent.

The true idea of licensing is simply a method of precaution, by way of carrying out, the more effectually, the apostle's rule, "Lay hands suddenly on no man" (1 Tim. 5 : 22). It has also served our Church well in America by protecting us largely against the immediate full ordination of men recently from other countries; in whose case it has often proved inconvenient, and perhaps impossible, to secure fully satisfactory evidence of integrity. Recurring to my early years in the ministry, I recall the stress laid upon this advantage, by the older men, in a Synod with which I was connected, and which was particularly liable, because of its geographical position near the great seaport, to be frequently and suddenly approached by men who had but lately set their feet upon our shores.

Again, in licensing, it was assumed, barring rare exceptional instances, that the candidate should be fully prepared for his work, and that he be empowered with *all* the authority needful for exercising all the functions of the minister. Indeed, so decidedly was this the understanding that in the early history of our Church in this country, as reported to us by the fathers, a concurrent testimony to the qualification and fitness of the applicant for his work was sought in the fact that he had already been invited to take charge of a congregation, which had adjudged him competent to do the work of a minister of Christ. The judgement of the laity, as well as that of the ministry, was thus held as a part of the external proof that a man was truly called to the holy office.

Licensing, instead of at once ordaining, did not usually contemplate the abridgment of any essential ministerial rights or powers. It gave full authority, only confined as to extent of time. One advantage consisted in simply letting a candidate lapse back into the ranks of the laity at the expiration of the specified year, without synodical trial, if ascertained by the tests which could be applied in the course of a limited time that some error had been committed in adjudging him as well fitted, morally, intellectually and practically, for incumbency in the minis-

try. The remedy was simple, consisting in merely refraining from granting ordination or renewing the license.

On the other hand, the *new* method, while professedly proceeding on the same principle, we hold to be illogical and improper in one prominent feature. Full authority is, indeed, conferred,—but upon whom? It is regularly conferred upon such as are admitted, and known to be, only in *part* prepared for their work. The true principle of licensing is virtually ignored. The *safeguard* is no longer the prime object contemplated. A little incidental *policy* of a temporal nature is made to displace it. The idea of serving congregations, as licentiates, in the strict pastoral sense, is waived—and is left out of sight,—because these men are expected to return to the Seminary for one more year. The precaution of laying hands suddenly on no man is, by undue and uncalled-for haste, at least badly strained if not broken. And the end expected to be gained by the change manifestly furnishes no compensation.

Again, a strong presumptive argument against the new rule is readily seen in the sphere of comparison. It differs decidedly from the principle maintained in other important callings. Look, for example, at the medical profession. What an absurdity would be conceived as being involved, were it proposed to furnish students with a diploma for practicing medicine, one year, or any other period of time, before the expiration of the contemplated collegiate course! The young man would thus be pronounced a doctor by the very men who maintained that he had not yet attained to the qualifications necessary for the *work* of a doctor. Of him it might be said that he is not a doctor in *theory*, while yet he *is declared* a doctor in *fact:* he *is* a physician, and yet he *isn't.* It would amount to a sort of accommodation or suspension, resembling that asserted about the coffin of Mohammed—neither lifted to the heavens nor yet resting on the earth. Our supposition has been advanced in reference to candidates for the medical profession; but why lay ourselves under the charge of like absurdity in relation to candidates for the highest and most responsible of all human positions?

So, also, when a young man is introduced and proposed at the legal *bar*, it is presumed that he is regarded as competent

for practicing at the bar. It is not to be intimated that he is there presented months or a whole year before he is adjudged competent for his public work. Were such premature action surmised by the assembled wisdom, the question would come forth without a moment's hesitation, "Why this undue, this unseemly haste?" Not another step of progress could for the time be secured before the court. The applicant would be referred back to his reading of law, until it should be assumed that competency had been reached and the pre-requisite fully regarded.

It might be asked whether any *mistakes* had thus far been committed since the introduction of the new rule into our Synod. Perhaps it is not necessary to answer such question. Suppose that, amidst our present favorable circnmstances, it could be shown that no serious evil had yet resulted from the practice of late years in this particular. It is still not right that we should permit ourselves to be exposed to the *liability* of committing mistakes in this unwarranted practice. The circumstances might some day be, in some respects, for some reason or other, less favorable. I hold that if there were no other reason prominent, the fact that the Synod is following a method that is a plain inversion and perversion of the principles of order should decide us at once to give it up. No ultimate good can come from relaxing the tension of principle at the suggestion of weak policy; no good from the attempt to do the work of to-morrow before the prior work of to-day shall have received due attention in natural order; no good from acting out the self-stultifying absurdity of calling a man a minister in the church of Christ a whole year before the time when, as we ourselves assume, he *may* attain to the fullness of qualification which we ourselves have agreed to demand of him.

Possibly the thoughts of some will revert, by way of questioning, to the time when the entire Seminary course was confined to two years. We may remind such, however, that the studies were then so arranged that the whole field was traversed within that period of time; and this was then regarded as sufficient. Hence the cases are not parallel. When the two years had passed, it was on every side understood that the full course

of study had been taken. It was in those days never dreamed that young men might be licensed at the end of the *first* year, nor at any stage short of the full course, with the understanding that they return to the Seminary to complete its curriculum. Had such unknown practice been pursued, *that* would afford us a parallel to the present anomalous method.

Other instances might perhaps be pointed out, in which men studied *privately*, or took only a very partial course in a theological seminary, and yet had license conferred upon them. These must, however, be viewed as independent cases, and as not affecting any general rule one way or another. Such are special cases, and come under special law; and the Synod is competent to be a law unto itself. But the main point is that even in such instances licensure was not granted until those holding the minister-making power were satisfied that the applicants had acquired qualifications fitting them for immediate entrance upon the public work of the pastor.

It is well to notice also that the first of the two proposed resolutions printed in the Minutes of 1885 is so worded with such care that it will cover all *exceptional* cases, as well as those applicants who have enjoyed the advantages of a theological seminary. The resolution reads thus: "*Resolved*, That two years hence, and thereafter, the Synod of East Pennsylvania will require in candidates for the ministry such qualifications as may be considered needful for immediate entrance into the pastoral service, instead of investing with ministerial authority in view of prospective completion of preparation." It is observed that the words "theological seminary" are not introduced. If you find a man intellectually furnished, as well as spiritually guided, for immediate work in the pastoral field, you license him, whether his Theology, Hebrew, Homiletics, etc., etc., were gained in the seminary, or under the pastor's supervision, or on the farm, in the workshop, or elsewhere—yes, you may license him. You may bid him go out to preach and to do the work of a pastor; but if you presume to suspend that service, and bid him first go back to his studies to gain the full complement of preparation, you show that you have strangely twisted things

out of their true relation,—that you have set that which belongs to the *front* in the *rear*.

2. It is now in place to refer to a few connected points. In thus doing, I shall give emphasis to impressions made upon my mind as a member, for the last thirteen years, of the committee of our Synod for examining candidates for the ministry. These impressions have been deepening from year to year, and my conscience has been disturbed. And, by the way, in order to guard my words, I desire that not a syllable of what I present has anything to do with the faithfulness of professors under whose instructions the candidates may have been trained. It is the *method*, as such, that I am scanning; and not a particle of implication in regard to teacher or teaching shall be intimated nor be ligitimately inferrable. And while on this thought, I would as earnestly deplore a misunderstanding by any who may be preparing for the ministry; for it may be difficult for them to find a more true and sympathizing friend than in myself. It is for principle, and not against men that I am speaking.

Some of the observations gained in the examining committee are not favorable to a continuance of the new method.

(1). The examinations cannot be made to cover the whole ground of seminary studies. The most important year, in some respects, of the three years, is yet to come. Then, as it sometimes happens, if a question is asked that may trench on a related branch, the committee must be reminded that such study will come in the following year, and therefore cannot be scanned. Yet the committee are supposed to agree in recommending for licensure, by way of taking *on trust* the *whole* of the third year's study. If this could be made to appear as right and sufficient, then why not take the first *two* years likewise on trust? Why not wholly dispense with examination by the Synod? But the Church would not be ready for that step; and we hope it never will be. The Seminary has its sphere of operation, and the Synod has another. Besides, some of our candidates may come from some unknown school, or they may never have seen a seminary at all. Then let us rid ourselves of inconsistency. The *whole* course, in *all cases*, should come under the actual

view of the examiners, and no presuming in reference to future proficiency should be tolerated either in Committee or Synod.

(2). Next, besides the wrong method of licensing on trust in part, there is never even a show made of complementing or supplementing the course of examination. The young man is licensed by a sort of mental reservation on the part of the Synod. The third year has been anticipated; and hence the Synod is at least consistent in *this*, that at the end of the third year it does not go behind its own work. No more is asked of the candidate than was formerly asked—only the presenting of a sermon or two for inspection, besides a diary of ministerial acts performed. This entire year of study is never touched by the committee. The licentiates, indeed, are never expected to *appear* before the committee at the end of the third year. Moreover, it would be, (according to what has been shown), inconsistent in the Synod *to* expect them thus to appear. The work of the third year is presumably anticipated and taken for granted at the end of the *second* year, when the license is recommended by the committee and accorded by the Synod.

A thought may yet be properly directed to the occasion of introducing the rule of licensing at the end of the second seminary year. Where or by whom it was conceived and suggested, I do not know; and whether it was at any time, or by any Synod, so formally established as to secure a place among written resolutions or by-laws, I have not yet ascertained. My home was on other territory at the time. The rule has at least become so accepted as to have all the force of law; and, therefore, if set aside at all, it must be so ordered by formal action. The change was made a goodly number of years ago, soon after the transferrence of our Commencements from September to June, and the extension of the Seminary course at Gettysburg from two to three years. The plea was that as nearly all our Synods met in September and October, several months must intervene between the closing of the Seminary course and the assembling of the Synods, and hence that a young man would be prevented during that interval from accepting a call and entering upon the pastoral work. For these reasons it was conceived that the Gordion knot might be cut by granting license in the previous

autumn. But it seems passing strange if the wisdom of the Church could not dispose of the quandary in some way that would insure propriety and consistency all round.

Perhaps various suggestions could be set forth. I herewith offer *one*. Let the students remain simply such—on a parity together—so long as the Seminary course is pursued, as was the case when some of *us* were students. And this, by the way, would in every sense be seemly and desirable. So long as the three classes continue together in the position of students, it would appear decidedly proper—unquestionably preferable—that there should be no official distinctions thrust in amongst them.

Then, if a student is requested to *preach* occasionally, particularly in the last year, let consent be secured from the Faculty, or at least from the chairman—a consent which we, in our day, were taught to regard as a verbal license simply to preach—such being temporary for each occasion and under a direction that was acknowledged to be supervisory.

Further, if there should, now and then, an instance occur in which provision were desirable for enabling a young man to accept a call and take charge of a congregation, between the Commencement in June and the Synod in the Autumn, let the *Conferences* or several pastors use their discretion in recommending *ad interim* license, according to the provision of synodical constitution, for that little space of time; and then let the candidate present himself before the Synod for a *full year's* license, and submit to thorough examination upon the *whole* course of studies in the curriculum for the three years.

After what has now been advanced, it will be in place to present a resumè of the principal thoughts offered:

(a). It appears plain that the Synod should speedily *abolish* the recent method of granting license one year, or less, before the candidate is considered prepared to enter upon the pastoral work, because that method is, in effect, an abandonment of the true principle of licensure.

(b). That the Synod should abolish that method because it gives us nothing adequate in return.

(c). That the Synod should abolish the new method because it substitutes a weak policy which is hasty and hurtful.

(d). That the Synod should abolish the new method because the whole conception of thus prematurely and unnecessarily licensing men is lame, inharmonious, and imprudent.

(e). That the Synod should abolish the new method because it tends to depreciate examination, and thus helps to render lax the requirements for entering the ministry of the gospel.

Before closing, it will be permissible to say that, not knowing what views might generally exist with regard to the matter involved, I presented the resolutions to the Synod at Ashland with some degree of hesitation, not knowing but that a method for some length of time rooted in its place might not be readily extirpated. But I was very agreeably encouraged, when prominent brethren at once chimed in with a heartiness which I had scarcely thought of instantly eliciting

Also, in giving a direct answer to the question presented in the programme, "Should the Preamble and Resolutions 'On Admitting to licensure' be adopted by Synod?" let me answer, unhesitatingly, YES! After long and close examination of the subject, it is my thorough conviction that the Synod should cease to induct men into the ministeral office before they are *professedly* and *admittedly* qualified to discharge the duties of the ministry of the gospel.

The *Second Resolution*, it will be seen at a glance, has two bearings; or, it may be said, that two reasons may be advanced in its support.

It may be that only a few Synods have practiced the new method of licensing before the completion of preparation. But if it is right that one Synod should abandon it, then is it right that all others should do likewise. Besides, fairness and good neighborship suggest that the change be made at the same time.

Otherwise, students who are rightfully expected to make application to any certain Synod might avail themselves of a standing opportunity to apply elsewhere. This would neither tend to promote the desired harmony between Synods nor to cure the evil deplored.

Indeed, so long as such standing invitation were continued in

any Synod or Synods, it is doubtful whether the passage of the first Resolution, by any number of Synods short of all those which have followed the rule complained of, could be expected to prove effective to any material extent.

Possibly the most successful way of reaching this part of the case would be to petition the General Synod to give expression, by resolution, in a request that all our Synods should at once harmonize in requiring competency for all pastoral service before admitting to the pastoral office.

[It is proper to add that after the reading of the paper before the Conference, not a word was uttered contrary to the position therein maintained; and that a resolution recommending to the Synod the adoption of the resolutions was offered and *unanimously* passed. Hence, let it be hoped that a strangely anomalous practice will be speedily set aside, and that no one will ever think of recalling or reviving it in the years to come.—M. S.]

ARTICLE VI.

ESOTERIC BUDDHISM.

By Rev. W. E. Parson, A. M., Washington, D. C.

In order to do justice to Esoteric Buddhism a word must be allowed as to Buddha and his place among the light-bringers of the world.

We should scarcely hope to speak intelligently of the esoteric doctrine, until we had acquired a just conception of the exoteric principles, whether the religion in question were Buddhism or Christianity.

My own idea of Buddha has always been that he was a real person, (though that has been questioned), who lived about 500 years B. C. He was impressed with the utter emptiness of the old Brahminical explanations of life, and he set himself to solve anew this great problem of existence. The result of his teachings was the reform which in after ages became Buddhism—and was for centuries the religion of more people than any other

faith could boast. He was in some sense truly *the Light of Asia*, as Mr. Edwin Arnold designated him. Briefly put the four great truths at the foundation of the Buddhistic system were:

1. All possible existence is suffering.
2. The cause of suffering is desire.
3. Suffering can only end with the cessation of desire.
4. There is a way to the ending of desire, which is through *Nirvana*.

These four principles form the ground-work of the teaching of Buddha. But there has been so much debasement of the original purity of Buddha's doctrine through subsequent speculation, or through intermixture with other superstitions, that modern Buddhism is about as much like the thing taught by the original founder as Mormonism is like the first pure teachings of Christianity. In Ceylon, in Burmah, in Siam, in Thibet, in Kashmir, Nepaul, China, Korea, and Japan, Buddhism, as a great missionary religion, came into conflict with some pre-existing native faith which it either modified greatly or absorbed altogether.

We can dismiss as later and fanciful all those stories about Buddha's welcome by angels, his confounding the wise at an early age, his tempting of the devil, his doing many miracles similar to those recorded in the New Testament.

These are all traditions of a later date than Christianity.

Indeed, we may say in general, that the earliest edition of the Buddhist writings did not exist before the years 410–436 A. D. The Chinese Canon was not collected until the 9th century of our era; so that, though Buddhism is older than Christianity, its oldest doctrines are more recent than the doctrines and writings substantiating the Christian faith.

But in order to come to the real subject before us I must not linger over ancient Buddhism.

I only bring up this much by way of introduction—and would express at the outset my admiration for many things in Buddha's life and teachings—I want to keep him in the pantheon of the world's religions. Hence I have entered upon this study, in all fairness, to keep off the profane hands that would dethrone this ancient deity.

And it seems to me if we are to keep the oriental Buddha we must reject these Saxons who have in this decade been parading themselves in the skin of this noble old lion of India. They are spurious Buddhists. If they are come to stay Buddha is a fallen idol, and there is nothing in his doctrine which the ravings of an occidental may not overturn in a night.

Before passing to Esoteric Buddhism I want to quote as my own sentiment a sentence or two from a Christian missionary who made a careful study of Buddhism. He says: "Buddhism, considered merely as an event in history, seems to me to have been more of a blessing than a curse. I sincerely believe that Buddhism has fulfilled a great mission which it was appointed to fulfil, by the providence of God.

"Nations, which were living in a state of utter savageness, were brought into a state of semi-civilization, which is the more apparent if we consider in what a savage state all those tribes remained which rejected Buddhism.

"What the Mongols were before they became Buddhists is written with blood on the pages of Asiatic history. Those very countries and peoples which were shut out from the centres of civilization by mountains and deserts were visited and brought under the influence of morality by those indefatigable Buddhist zealots, for whom no mountain was too high, no desert too dreary. In countries like China and Japan, where Buddhism found a sort of civilization existing, it acted like a dissolving acid, undermining the existing religious systems, and thus preparing the way for a new religion to enter,—for Christianity, if we had but half the enthusiasm that inspired those disciples of Buddha."*

This is strong and liberal language, yet just; and ought to prepare the way for a dispassionate study of these modern claims concerning this ancient faith.

Mr. Sinnet has given us two books—"*The Occult World*," and "*Esoteric Buddhism*"—which will furnish us ample material through which to become acquainted with the claims of these new prophets. In the "Occult World" we learn how the author

*Buddhism as An Event in History. J. W. Eitel, p. 32.

came by this knowledge—and in "Esoteric Buddhism" he sets forth fully what this new doctrine is.

And perhaps it ought to be set down in fairness to the author that he disclaims any special connection with *Buddhism.* He has only incidentally chosen that faith *"as more closely allied with the esoteric doctrine than any other."*

Suppose we look first at the manner in which this knowledge has come to the light of day.

The claim is put forth that there exists in the secret recesses of Thibet some brotherhood the members of which are endowed with extraordinary powers. The Mahatmas, or the Brothers, are the initiated who have learned the secrets of the occult world. For centuries they have kept to themselves, and passed on to the initiated only, these wonderful secrets. Hitherto, Mr. Sinnet says, they have always prescribed the absolute concealment of these mysteries from the profane herd. Again he remarks that his giving these doctrines out for criticism will seem to their followers "a terrible profanation of the great mysteries." He declares that it is 'a new revelation for the whole world.' As soon as one was initiated into this Brotherhood he was bound over to the most inviolable secresy. It looks suspicious, on the face of it, that this barrier should be broken down by a trio of prying Occidentals—Mad. Blavatsky, Col. Olcutt, and Mr. Sinnett.

Indeed, we find it almost impossible to reconcile the statement in the opening chapter of Esoteric Buddhism where the author says—*"It is impossible to imagine any human act more improbable than the unauthorized revelation by any such chela, to persons in the outer world, that he is one"*—with the first sentence of the same chapter, in which he says that he obtained his information *easily.*

Again he says he might have curry-combed all India without being able to bring to light any of the information which he is revealing. It almost excites a *horse-laugh* to hear a man talk of *curry-combing* India in literary research, who has just declared that he is not an Oriental scholar.

After all this mystery, this age, this distance and seclusion, this Brotherhood into which access is so difficult, and out of

which no secret may ever pass, I confess that I have not credulity enough to believe that this esoteric science which from Buddha's time till now has been so jealously guarded, has been conveyed to a 19th century Englishman *"without conditions of the usual kind"*—as Mr. Sinnett says—but to the express end that he might convey it in his turn to the world at large.

"I make these statements * * not on the basis of any researches of my own,—which I am not Oriental scholar enough to attempt,—but on the authority of a Brahmin initiate who is himself a first-rate Sanskrit scholar as well as an occultist."

Why does not Mr. Sinnett give us the name of his authority? Why do the adepts agree to throw this Brotherhood, as one has well queried, into a secret place "just beyond the furthest limits of western exploration, much as the ancients placed the Fortunate Isles * * well beyond the boundaries of their own meagre geographical investigations."

Just here I want to insert Question 131 from Mr. Olcutt's Buddhist Catechism—p. 62:

131. Q. "Are there any doctrines in Buddhism which we are required to accept on faith?"

A. "No; we are earnestly enjoined to accept nothing whatever on faith, whether it be written in books, handed down from our ancestors, or taught by the sages, Our Lord Buddha has said that we must not believe a thing said merely because it is said."

[Concerning which we might ask parenthetically, Shall we believe what Lord Buddha has said because he has said it?]

Yet Mr. Sinnett says that the whole body of teaching which the Theosophical Society offers to the unitiated world "can only take the form of a set of statements on authority."*

Now, for a set of men who boast that they *accept nothing without proof* it does seem to be asking a great deal when they require *us*, on the mere *ipse dixit* of one person, to accept this new revelation for the whole world, because we are asked to believe without proof. We are implored to believe in other senses beside the ordinary, in unknown or unsuspected powers; that

*Vide appendix to "Occult World," p. 227.

there are methods of communication hitherto unknown; that the ascetic, when purified, can show supernatural faculties; that he may find himself, for example, able to pass through material obstacles, walls, ramparts, etc., he may throw his phantasmal appearance into many places at once. No wonder that the leader of the Washington Branch of this deep science declares that various forms of mental derangement, hallucinations of all sorts, delirium, idiocy, suicide, murder and every violation of the social order threaten the weak and misguided votary of theosophy.

Again, we are asked to believe, on the mere assertions of men, who do not claim to have seen, or had any other proof than the word of others, whom they do not name, that "from time immemorial there has been a certain secret region in Thibet, which to this day is quite unknown to and unapproachble by any but initiated persons, and inaccessible to the ordinary people of the country as to any others, *in which adepts have always congregated.*"

Any man who can believe that is capable of believing anything. It is sometimes said that Hume framed his famous argument against the Christian miracles to see what he could do by pure logic to overturn Christianity. And it would seem as if the *theosophists* had created this imaginary Thibetan arcanum in order to test the limits of human credulity.

The only way to keep any decent respect for Buddhism is to utterly repudiate this new doctrine that comes tricked out in oriental phrase. It is carrying the thing a little too far, when an intelligent 19th century occidental rushes off to the east, peopling some imaginary province with an imaginary Buddhistic sect, and then pouring into one of this shadowy group the ravings of his own fancy, produces a jumble of evolution, spiritualism, and Buddhism, which is to be palmed off upon the erratic souls who are always on the outlook for some new thing. The result of this will be to transform our sometime *Lightbringer*,—(our Buddha for whom we might have kept some reverence),—into a synonym for darkness.

On the last page of Esoteric Buddhism Mr. Sinnett claims

that as to Buddhism "*its mighty fabric of knowledge has* HITHERTO *been veiled from view.*"

That is to say the old Buddhism is *nil*, and this "mushy mystery," which no one before had ever attempted to put forward 'in its plain abstract purity' is to be accepted as the final word of an ancient faith.

I do not know a more thoroughly ridiculous episode in literature, and in the anthology of religions it is a weed that we can only pull to fling away.

Perhaps the best comment on the *finality* of this utterance is to be found in the opening sentence of the introduction to the Am. Ed. of Esoteric Buddhism where the author says that the book was written in *1883*, and he ventures to recommend it to the public anew in *1884*, glad that no material error has been found in the meanwhile. That is, he has not been found out in a twelvemonth. This is the very acme of absurdity.

It has been my good fortune to live for some years in a Buddhist country. Buddhism is the popular religion of Japan to-day. Buddhism has been there more than a thousand years—and has done what the missionary whom I quoted said—it has modified the old Shinto, or native faith. I have gone into many of their temples, have met their priests behind their altars, have talked with them through intelligent interpreters, and have met one or two of the most advanced and liberal of the Buddhist sects, plying them with all kinds of questions, which they freely and politely answered. Of course, if there were an esoteric doctrine, which the unitiated could not hope to receive, then my ignorance would be worth as much as any other man's. But, I can give this as my candid opinion that in all Japan, with its many priests and millions of Buddhists, there is no suspicion of any such esoteric doctrine, no knowledge of any such Brotherhood of Mahatmas.

Indeed, I found as an invariable rule in Japan that the most intelligent Japanese found nothing in Buddhism to give them any mental satisfaction.

There is thus presented to us the anomaly that, whereas among us, certain persons who affect a superiority in mental and spiritual qualities are taking up with this new-fangled religion, in those

countries where it has had centuries of trial it has been thrown off as inadequate by the highest classes.

I remember once Mr. Ito, the present Prime Minister of Japan, said to me in rebuke of an American who was affecting Buddhism in Japan—"That is all nonsense! Why, I am a Japanese, and I was never in a Buddhist temple in my life. I would be ashamed to be seen there."

To my knowledge, from the Emperor down, there is not a man in the Empire, of prominence in official or literary life, who is known as a Buddhist adept. It seems almost unreasonable to think that, if this religion had contained such possibilities and revelations, it would have had a development for a thousand years in this Empire without being able to show at the end of that period one intelligent convert, one follower who drank deep from this occult spring.

I am anxious to see all the good in Buddhism that does exist there. I believe with Mr. Eitel, whom I quoted, that it has been more of a blessing than a curse. I have no sympathy with the idea that men are going to be eternally lost for not accepting a higher faith, of whose very existence they were in utter ignorance.

But, after making all these concessions, we must pass an intelligent judgment upon Buddhism.

And that judgment I can best give in the words of a friend, a man whom I never saw in a Christian church; who was what we should commonly call an unbeliever. He was addressing a company of educated Japanese in the capital of their country, all of whom were born under the shadow of Buddhism—but not one of them an open Buddhist. He said, and I think with the assent of Europeans and Japanese alike:

"I am certainly not one of those who affect to find in the popular religions of Japan, or of India, anything as noble or as pure in sentiment as exists in the different forms of European Christianity. If you strip from the popular Buddhism of today all the superstitions and follies with which the ignorance and the vice of the centuries that have rolled by since Shakya-Muni lived have besmeared it; and if you load Christianity with all the effects of the corruption and the brutality of the eighteen

hundred years through which it has lived among races that never more than half understood it, and that polluted its original pure sweetness with the rough wildness and terrible blood-thirstiness of their own dark traditions; if you do this, you may make Buddhism appear preferable to Christianity; but the comparison is not a fair one. Place the common Buddhism of the worshiper in the temples of Japan to-day beside the common Christianity of European church-goers also of to-day, and there can hardly be any doubt as to the result of a comparison. I say, therefore, that if a Christian missionary in Japan succeeds in persuading a man or a woman to give up the superstitions of the prevailing Buddhism and to accept instead the orthodox doctrines of Christianity, even if it be the lowest and most irrational form of Christianity, he has wrought a great change for the better in the spiritual condition of that man or woman."*

Thus far I have only referred in general terms to the claims of Esoteric Buddhism. Perhaps when we look into Mr. Sinnett's book we shall find this new revelation justifying itself by its exceeding wisdom, and be won over to it in spite of the great drafts it makes upon our credulity. Let us look for a little to discover.

In regard to the constitution of man it is affirmed that there are seven principles—1. The body; 2. Vitality; 3. The astral body; 4. The animal soul; 5. The human soul; 6. The spiritual soul; 7. Spirit. We have some trouble usually in maintaining the distinction between soul and spirit—and we should be lost altogether amid the mazes of this seven-fold division of man. Indeed, as we analyze the method on which this division proceeds we can discover no reason why the limit was set at seven. It might have been seventeen just as well, or seventy—for in few, if any cases, is the fifth principle fully developed. And it goes without saying that the sixth is therefore still in embryo. And as the sixth principle is the vehicle of the seventh, we can readily see that the seventh must be *in nubibus*. This might have gone on indefinitely—but it could scarcely have

*Extract from a lecture on "Natural Knowledge," delivered March 9, 1878, in Tokio Dai Gaku by Prof. Robt. H. Smith.

added anything to the sum of our positive knowledge. The one point in this scheme on which the popular fancy has laid hold is the *astral body*—which Mr. Sinnett says "is no more a being than any cloud-wreath in the sky which happens to settle into the semblance of some animal form." It never leaves the body except at death, nor migrates far from the body. All of which might be affirmed of the skin of a man, or of his shadow —and we are no wiser with this sevenfold subdivision of our nature than we were before the Mahatma revelation burst upon us.

Passing from the constitution of man to the constitution of the universe we come upon what is meant to be the most elaborate system of evolution, beside which the evolution theories of modern science shall seem puerile.

The evolution of Esoteric Buddhism is not a theory. It is *absolute knowledge.* The claim is soberly put forth that the occult scientists know what they know of evolution just as the physical scientists know for a fact that the spectrum consists of seven colors, and the musical scale of seven tones. Here is laid in this immense claim of absolute knowledge the foundation for dogmatism and even bigotry, which show themselves later on when the author declares that '*one religion is by no means as good as another*,' and claims that Buddhism is '*the one great religion of the world.*" Now, when we come to look into this new phase of evolution we find that what is new is of little value, and what is valuable is not new; the whole treatment of the subject falling under that suspicion which always attaches to those who claim to be prophets after the event.

Undoubtedly, the value of this revelation would be vastly greater, as proof of the existence of the Mahatmas, if it had antedated Mr. Darwin's books by a few years. The date of this disclosure, to say the least, is unfortunate.

If "*Esoteric Buddhism*" were older than "*The Origin of Species*" we should have Mr. Darwin the borrower from Mr. Sinnett, and the glory of this latest scientific theory would be reflected in far Thibet. As it is we can not help wondering why the adept did not speak first. I am not credulous enough to receive all this through an Englishman from some reputed Brahmin, (name not given), *after* Mr. Darwin and Mr. Spencer have

had their say, without a little protest. I am not suspicious naturally, and I have a very warm side for the Evolution Hypothesis, but the order of this marvelous disclosure as to the earth's origin, and the fact that our Mahatma is made to speak dogmatically as to Evolution, some years after the true prophet has spoken, begets in me the same feeling I have in reading Swedenborg's glib familiarity with people and things on the planets and moons of his day. I never can refrain from wondering why Swedenborg did not once think of skipping over to *Uranus, discovered by Herschel 10 years after Swedenborg's death.* There would have been an opportunity to clinch his claims such as no discreet prophet should have overlooked. Why did he not take a peep into the moons of Mars, so lately disclosed to mankind by our own astronomer, Prof. Asaph Hall?

Evolution, by an unknown Mahatma through a little known theosophist, *comes 25 years too late to have any evidential value.*

For the method of Mr. Darwin I have great respect, since I believe it to be an honest scientific attempt to explain on natural principles how the universe came to be what it is. But the method of the Mahatmas is the very climax of nonsense; and only becomes serious because so many people, who seem rather evenly balanced on other subjects, have been deluded into thinking that they have found here a last and best word as to nature and religion.

To show that there is ground for denominating this the very climax of absurdity let me give a single leaf from the chapter on the *World Periods.* It is stated with mathematical exactness that "the great continent, the father of nearly all the present continents," sank some thousand centuries ago, and that Poseidon, the last of the islands, went down with a crash, *11,446 years ago.* The days, hours, minutes and seconds could have been given as readily as the years, for it is affirmed that an adept can predict the exact hour of such great cataclysms "with as mathematical a certainty as eclipses."

Now, if we could get an adept to predict that in 11,446 years, 4 months, 8 days, 29 hours, 13 minutes, 59½ seconds from noon of July 4th, there should occur another great geological cataclysm, we should feel that the reputation of the adept would be

safe, as safe as we should be from the dangers of the catastrophe. But the thought occurs to a humane man, to an unsophisticated, matter of fact, utilitarian,—why not get our adept down to predictions that will be verifiable, and merciful at the same time. I am afraid we shall have to vote our Mahatma Brothers a very inhuman Brotherhood—since by the affirmations of Mr. Sinnett they could have detailed in advance the exact moment of the recent earthquakes at Nice—they might have foretold, and so prepared the people for, the destruction at Charleston last Summer. If these men are moving about among us with ability to calculate the exact hour of such cataclysms "with as mathematical a certainty as eclipses," and continue to hold their peace, we ought to vote them a refined species of anarchists, who know of coming ruin and make no sign.

It seems to me that instead of these higher powers being "dangerous to society generally, and provocative of all manner of crimes which would utterly defy detection," they might be made the means of great good to society.

The limits of a paper like this are too narrow to allow of a thorough criticism of even a single phase of Esoteric Buddhism, but I can not omit to notice what seems a most unscientific statement in connection with Mr. Sinnett's evolution theories. He says that "the evolution of man is a process *still going on, and by no means yet complete.*"

But all the conclusions of modern science point to the fact that on earth there will never be any being higher than man. He is the *terminus ad quem.*

It is therefore a false application of Darwin, and the Mahatma becomes ridiculous when he suggests that we ought to "recognize the probability that to our remote descendants we may be as that unwelcome progenitor [the ape] to us."

Evolution *is* going on—in laws, customs, society and government, but organic evolution does not play a part any longer in the life of man. He has transferred this law from himself to his surroundings, and Mr. Sinnett's Mahatma became unscientific in claiming that the law was still in force with respect to the natural life of man.

I shall pass over a number of things I had noted for com-

ment, contenting myself with the mere mention of several other points that would tax the powers of the most credulous.

Take the following for a jargon of nonsense:

"It is no paradox to say that simply by reason of ignorance do ordinary theologians think they know so much about God. And it is no exaggeration to say that the wondrously endowed representatives of occult science, whose mortal nature has been so far elevated and purified that their perceptions range over other worlds and other states of existence, and commune directly with beings as much greater than ordinary mankind as man is greater than the insects of the field,—it is the mere truth that they never occupy themselves at all with any conception remotely resembling the God of churches and creeds." The unreasonableness of which becomes manifest as we recall that foundation truth of all theologians—"no man hath seen God at any time."

On the other hand, if it were true that the representatives of occult science do commune directly with these very exalted beings then they are about in the state claimed by many in the Christian Church; and these exalted beings seem to resemble very closely the God of the churches and creeds, in the very claim that they are "as much greater than ordinary mankind as man is greater than the insects of the field."

In another place Mr. Sinnett speaks of—"those great beings, the perfected efflorescence of former humanity," (whatever that may mean), "who, though far from constituting a supreme God, reign nevertheless in a divine way over the destinies of our world."

In short Esoteric Buddhism where it is rational and coherent is polytheistic, making larger claims than Darwin in science, and bolder than the Bible of the Christian in theology. A mind that can take in without stumbling all this and more, on which I could not touch, is certainly in no position to descant upon the credulity of any other man, no matter what absurdities his creed may contain.

Think of it! An adept may become, during life even, one of the conscious, directing powers of the planetary system to which he belongs. He has it within his power to select his own next incarnation. If a man should go about talking much of that we

should feel constrained to order a lunacy commission. Mr. Sinnett says that the Lamas of Thibet state beforehand in what child they shall be reincarnated—not only selecting him, but announcing when and where the child so chosen will be born. This, he declares, at which travelers only laugh for want of the knowledge enabling them to sift fancy from fact, is "a sober scientific achievement"—adding that he "*very rarely* fails."

"We say very rarely, because there are some accidents of physical nature which can not be entirely guarded against."

All of which is not only nonsense philosophically, but is inaccurate historically; since the appointment to the Lamaship of Thibet is determined by lot for the last hundred years, in accordance with an edict of the Chinese Emperor.

When Mr. Sinnett comes to something that truly belongs to Buddhism, of which we should like to learn some new truth, such as an esoteric knowledge might confer upon us, he fails us altogether. On the doctrine of *Nirvana*, for example, he brings not one scintilla of light to penetrate the darkness which has always invested this subject for our occidental minds.

"Only stray hints about the nature of this great mystery have reached me," he says.

"Nirvana is a sublime state of conscious rest in omniscience" —which is a glittering generality no better than Arnold's definition:

> "The aching craze to live ends."—Arnold p. 173.

the opposite of what Dante pictures in those who

> "* * without hope, live ever in desire."—*Inferno*, IV, 40.

The great achievement of adeptship on earth is the passing of the ego-spirit into the ineffable condition of Nirvana. This achievement exacts a total suspension of animation in the body for periods of time compared with which the longest cataleptic trances known to ordinary science are insignificant.

I was over at the United States Hospital for the Insane not long since, and saw a man there who went to sleep in Nov. 1885, and did not wake up for one year and eight days. After a lucid interval of three weeks he dozed off again, and was still sleeping at last accounts. The doctors do not know what to make of him. Here is a possible explanation of the mystery.

He is an occultist, and his own ego-spirit is now passing into the ineffable condition of Nirvana.

One of the risks attending this achievement is the doubt whether, when once Nirvana is attained, the ego will be willing to return. If our patient dies we shall conclude that "to stoop to earth, after having been in Nirvana, is too dreadful a collapse."

How would this do for an intelligible definition of Nirvana—"to merge the glorified individuality into that sum total of all consciousness, which esoteric metaphysics treat as absolute consciousness, which is non-consciousness."

There is a definition, now, that defines, and we fully agree with the next sentence of the author in which he says that the human mind is not qualified to apprehend these paradoxical expressions, "and it is waste of time to haggle over them." Which scarcely tallies with his claim elsewhere made that "at least the subject has emerged into the clear daylight of modern thinking." So we might go on, not to much profit, finding our *Light of Asia* snuffed out by these modern jugglers; or at most finding oriental names for universal truths—*Devachan* and *Avitchi* standing for the two states of which all races seem to teach, corresponding to Heaven and Hell; *Karma* is the entity that survives, the individuality, the personality which death can not destroy.

Buddha's place, fortunately, is secure in literature, and in religion.

Esoteric Buddhism may catch the fancy of a few for a day, be a literary fashion, an affectation, and then disappear as completely as Poseidon, which sank with a crash 11,446 years ago. Canon Mosley said of Thomas Carlyle that he was an accepter of all religions and a believer in none. There are always some such, to whom a new fashion in religion is an attraction. They may find two grains of wheat in this bushel of chaff, sitting at the feet of an imaginary Mahatma; waiting for fuller tidings from that No-man's-land in Thibet: And what shall you and I do in the meantime, but turn from the Light of Asia to the Light of the World, wondering the while at the credulity of the incredulous.

ARTICLE VII.

THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH TO SUPPLY AN ADEQUATE MINISTRY.

By Rev. H. C. Holloway, A. M., Middletown, Pa.

The system of Beneficiary Education has an honorable history. That it is not attended by some imperfections we would not pretend to deny, but these do not materially affect its essential excellence; not any more than the dark spots on the disk of the ever radiant sun, destroy the glorious light. It has often seemed to us that the chronic fault-finders with this system, who fail to give us something better, might be more worthily employed. It is easy to find fault, but hard to do better.

I. ITS HISTORY.

From the earliest ages it has been the policy of the Christian Church to aid in the education of worthy but indigent students who had consecrated themselves to the gospel ministry. The schools of the prophets, mentioned in the Old Testament Scriptures, seem to have been of this character, whilst the apostles, during their preparatory training, were dependent for the means of subsistence upon the great Head of the Church. This custom was kept up through the middle ages by the monastic schools which were liberally endowed for this purpose, and it is still maintained by the Roman Church. "Her priests are to this day all, and altogether educated at the Church's expense." The principle seems to be, that as the Church hopes to receive the benefit of labor, it devolves upon her to furnish the means to qualify the instrument that shall perform it.

The Protestant Churches have been no less wisely liberal in their provisions for the supply of their pulpits. Neither by those of the Lutheran or Reformed name was poverty allowed to bar any worthy young man from the privilege of qualifying himself for the Christian ministry. Aid was furnished him, sometimes by scholarships attached to the schools, and some-

times by contributions taken up directly for this purpose by the congregations. As an example may be cited the act passed by the first national synod of the French Reformed Church in 1559: "In order that the Church may be furnished with a sufficient number of pastors, kings and princes, and the nobility shall be petitioned and exhorted to lay some part of their revenues towards the support of persons for the work of the ministry. Colloquies (*i. e.*, presbyteries) shall take the best measures in the premises that matters of so great necessity may be successful. If single churches have not means, their neighbors shall join them, so that one poor scholar at least may be maintained in every colloquy. And, in order that this design shall not fail, every fifth penny of all churches shall be set apart, when it may conveniently be done, to be employed in this service."—(Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia, Vol. I).

The same course was pursued in later years in Scotland and England. In the United States the scarcity of ministers and the exigencies of an extending population, constrained ecclesiastical bodies and prominent members in the Church, early to adopt vigorous measures for meeting the demand thus created, and education was freely granted to young men contemplating the ministry who were unable to defray their own expenses.

Thus we find what are known as "Boards of Education," maintained by nearly all the prominent Christian denominations of our land, organized to aid worthy young men who are studying for the Christian ministry. More than one half of the ministers in our own Church have been assisted in this way. "Full three fourths of the ministry in the Presbyterian Church have thus been more or less helped into sacred orders." In the Episcopal Church, "The Society for the increase of the ministry," has helped to ordination about one thousand young men. It has adopted a very liberal policy, and allows stipends according to the needs of the student, the maximum amount being as much as three hundred dollars per annum. In 1815 was formed what is known as the "American Education Society," and the "whole number of students aided by it up to the year 1880 is 6,724." The German Reformed, the Baptist and Methodist

Episcopal Churches, have similar societies for the education of candidates for the ministry. "And we must add," says another, "that it is to the wise and liberal policy thus pursued the fact is largely due that the ministry of Protestant Christendom throughout the world has attained its present high repute, not only for sound moral and religious character, but also for broad intelligence and extensive learning."

It remains true, then, that the system, known as Beneficiary Education, has an honorable record, and in seeking to maintain it we are only in the line of a high historic custom, sanctioned by the Christian Church from the earliest ages.

II. THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH TO SUPPLY AN ADEQUATE MINISTRY.

By an adequate ministry we have reference to both *numbers* and *competency*. In answer to the former, we might ask, have we not already as many, and even *more* ministers than the Church needs? Is the supply not already greater than the demand?

THE SUPPLY AS TO NUMBERS.

Paradoxical as it may seem, we say we have ministers both too *few* and too *many*. When we see how some congregations go about the matter of selecting a man when they are vacant, as well as their requirements in the candidate, we feel that there is an *under* production of ministers. In our judgment the standard of requirement by too many of our congregations rests on a false basis; it is too eminently worldly, and not sufficiently Christian. The humiliating confession must be made that in too many instances the man looked for is the one who is worth the most to a congregation from a material standpoint, rather than from the spiritual. The basis of requirement ought to be more specially a renewed heart and a sanctified intellect. Men for our pulpits, if rightly judged, must be estimated as to their value, by what they really *are*, and not so much by the material advantages they might be to a congregation.

When, upon the other hand, we see how many worthy ministers are unemployed in the active work, then we are inclined to the belief that we have ministers enough, and even to spare. But if the clergymen bereft of parishes and the widowed

churches should be well wedded, there would be nearly an equation. Were there an altogether healthy spiritual state in Zion, this embarrassment would settle itself. The difficulty seems to be one of misadjustment. There too often prevails a false idea, on the one hand, as to what constitutes a proper field of ministerial work; and on the other hand, of the qualities which make a desirable pastor. We believe there is an *under* production of ministers who are ready to take the field that opens to them, and do their best, with the conviction that it is a great thing to be wanted *anywhere* in this glorious kingdom; and that the church that seeks them is the church they will seek, striving to build it grandly, and being as grandly built by it.

Then, too, there is also an *over* production of fastidious, self-elated churches who look for some great man to come and build them up, and make them the pride and ornament of all the region, while they stand still "and see the salvation of God."

It is true, then, that we have ministers both too many and too few. But that we have an over production of *true* ministers of the gospel, we do not believe; and our belief rests upon the divine word, and the moral state of the world. The production is by far inadequate to the demand. But so long as the Church is not more economical in the use of its men, or the *none* use of them, there will always seem to be a surplus of ministers. There is need of better and wiser economy in this matter; and, in order to this, the standard of requirement on the part of many of our congregations, as well as some in the ministry, must be modified, and placed on a more eminently Christian basis. A burning zeal for piety in the community, and a baptism of enlightened zeal for the Lord upon the Church, would put a new aspect on the situation, and turn away the present evil drift in spiritual things in Zion.

Leaving out of view the demands of the foreign field, we have not ministers enough. The Macedonian cry has become a familiar one. In our own Lutheran Zion is heard the complaint of want of ministers, and many of our own fold are wandering without shepherds; just the precise condition that moved, to its very depths, the Saviour's loving heart. We have possi-

bly eight millions of a Lutheran population in this country, and this number is annually increased by large accessions from Europe. Our four thousand ministers are scarcely adequate to supply our seven thousand and two hundred congregations with regular preaching, and look after the spiritual needs of our one million communicants. As a Church, we are hardly in a position to engage in aggressive work. In the great West, we have never yet been able to keep up with our moving population. At many points we should now organize churches in order to do our part in saving this land to Christianity.

We should not forget that the deepest problem now before this nation is not any of those which come up for civil legislation, but that of ecclesiastical legislation,—of building churches among the countless hordes of immigrants who come among us, supply them with teachers sent from God, and keep the altar-light burning in the homes which our children are building in the great West, "the seat of an empire which, within a century, may outweigh that upon the Atlantic slope." The truth is, there is no measuring excess of the demand beyond the supply. The Saviour's own language expresses the facts in hand: "The harvest truly is plenteous, and the laborers are few." There is an unquestioned demand for more ministers. God has created that demand, and it is the duty of the Church to heed it, and make all possible haste to supply it. The number and competency of ministers must be proportionate to the demand, in order that the Church may care not only for her own immediate fold, but also to engage in aggressive work. "There remaineth yet very much land to be possessed." The Church is not only to place itself on the defensive as a beleaguered army in a hostile country surrounds itself with fortifications, but is to be stoutly and persistently *aggressive*. She is called upon, not so much to protect as to propagate the truth; not so much to maintain a position as to establish a kingdom. And it seems to us, necessity is laid upon us to pray as we have never prayed: "*Lord, send forth laborers into the harvest,*" and work as we have never worked to increase the meagre force of our already overtaxed ministry.

THE SUPPLY AS TO COMPETENCY.

But we may have a supply adequate as to numbers, and yet not have a ministry adequate to the *needs* of the Church. It is not the largest army that always does the best service for its country, but a well equipped and brave soldiery frequently achieves the best results. We want, therefore, not only ministers, and more of them, but ministers of a certain kind. We want a competent ministry; competent both in heart and mind; well equipped, spiritually, morally, intellectually, and brave. It has been well said: "One man of earnest faith, clear mind, and warm heart will be worth more to us than half a score of those who, while not insincere, are very imperfectly prepared, both by nature and by grace, for the position of leaders among the hosts of Israel."

In order to the best results in this regard then, it is necessary that the best care be taken in our selection of young men for the ministry. There is doubtless need for more careful sifting of the material offering itself for the office of the holy ministry. Persons sometimes are taken at too tender an age. None should be received on our funds before they are qualified by age, experience or attainments, to settle so important a question. Young men should not be encouraged prematurely to make choice of the ministry as their calling without the opportunity of deliberately and carefully examining the whole subject, and intelligently realizing the responsibility of the obligation they assume. The test of character, in too many instances, has cost the Church too much. The promises of Spring are no sure index of the harvests of Summer. Early indications are not always realized. For want of more deliberate action, expectations are often disappointed and reverses experienced in Beneficiary Education, and the Church and common cause of religion suffer. To judge of human character, is frequently a matter of great difficulty as well as of great delicacy, especially so in the young; but evidently pastors of long experience are the best qualified to judge at what age, as well as what kind of young men, it is safest to receive on our funds for aid.

Again, in order to a competent ministry we must have special regard to *sterling piety*. The evidence of this, in all young men

who are in the course of training, should be clear and unmistakable as far as man can judge. Here we should always "make haste slowly," and lay hands "suddenly on no man." The chief necessity in the man for the holy office "is personal piety, a deep possession in one's own soul of the faith and hope and resolution which he is to offer to his fellow-men for their new life. Nothing but fire kindles fire. To know in one's whole nature what it is to live by Christ; to be His, not our own; to be so occupied with gratitude for what He did for us and for what He continually is to us that His will and His glory shall be the sole desires of our life, I wish that I could put in some words of new and overwhelming force the old accepted certainty that that is the first necessity of the preacher, that to preach without that is weary and unsatisfying and unprofitable work, that to preach with that is a perpetual privilege and joy."*

But not every pious young man will make a good minister, or a minister at all. The absence of a fair average of brains and good sense, must be regarded as invalidating any other apparent signs of a call to the ministry. To be inducted into the holy office is the highest honor the Church on earth can confer on any one. Such an one is called to be a "laborer together with God." There can be no higher alliance than this. The Church, therefore, does not desire in her ministry those who fancy that they are conferring a favor upon her by studying for the sacred office. She does not need *such* men. Nor does she need the services of those who seek this office, either for respectability, or ease, or profit. All such would be mere drones in the hive, ecclesiastical loafers in the courts of the Lord, ministerial dandies, but who could have no burden of the Lord for the people and "care of the churches."

Devoted piety, without large brain power, often accomplishes much. "Brains in the ministry, without piety, are alway a curse." There is need of the Spirit of God to give the brain, whether large or small, impulse and inspiration to make it of the utmost value and power. From lack of this come the general rage of the young men in the ministry for novelties, the tendency to

*Lectures on Preaching by the Rev. Phillips Brooks, pp. 38, 39.

laxness in doctrine and morals, the aping of science and philosophy. There is an imperative call for a generation of ministers into whose souls the Holy Spirit shall burn the great, too much forgotten truths of sin and salvation; and whose lips He shall touch with the live coal from the altar of God. Souls on fire with the love of Christ and a lost world, and with a conscious sense of their mission from God, will develop, along with moral and spiritual power, the intellectual vigor, for the want of which the progress of Christianity languishes and loiters.

The Levitical priesthood was the priesthood first of a family and then of a tribe. They were the dispensers of the truth and grace of God. They appeared before God and before men. They sustained relations of sacred nearness to both. They were in a special sense to be "a holy generation, a royal priesthood, a peculiar people." In sanctifying them, the fountains of knowledge and devotion were purified for the nation and the Church. All relations and conditions would be affected by the blessed change. All plans would feel the quickening touch of the new life. "The wilderness and solitary place would be glad for them, and the desert rejoice and blossom as the rose."

It is so with the Christian priesthood—the ministry of the word and the sacraments. It is not the priesthood of a tribe, but of all people—the universal priesthood of all believers. Out of this congregation of the believing, it has pleased God to call his ministry to whom in a special sense, "a dispensation of the gospel is committed." They are not lords over this heritage, but stewards of the mysteries of the grace of God. They are ministers—that is, servants—servants of God and of his people for Jesus' sake. They are "to show unto men the way of salvation." They are "to preach the word, to be instant in season, and out of season, to reprove, rebuke, exhort, with long-suffering and doctrine." They are to watch in all things, to endure afflictions, to do the work of the Lord, and to make full proof of their ministry.

For such an office and work, who is sufficient? Not the gifted and the educated in the schools only of *earthly* wisdom. Not the amiable and cultured, merely, in the moralities of natural virtue. Not the sons of Levi even, who are born alone of

the will of the flesh and of the will of man. In the case of all who aspire to this holy calling, there must be the new birth "from above." They must be born of God. He must "give them power to become the sons of God," and "to believe on his name." They must "have passed from death unto life." In the case of every one entering the ministry, the great rending choice must have been made, which separates them from the world, which fixes their character, and determines them as Christ's.

Each one thus called and justified and sanctified, must be able to say with St. Paul: "Henceforth let no man trouble me, for I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus." An unsaved ministry knows not how to save others. A worldly ministry is a blight upon the Churches. An immoral ministry is an inundation of sin. A contentious ministry is a fire brand in the community. An indolent ministry is a nuisance. A selfish ministry has no part in the kingdom of Christ and of God. And, on the other hand, all that we can think and know of purity, sympathy, fidelity, and self-renouncing love, are embraced in the idea of the holy ministry A Christian ministry, who are Christ-like, is our greatest need. While we pray for an increase of the ministry, let us labor unceasingly to create a ministry baptized with the Spirit of our blessed Lord. The knowledge of the schools, without the unction of the Holy One, can never accomplish the needed results.

Again, in order to a competent ministry we must have an *educated ministry*. A ministry of consecrated spirit and holy living, in order to the greatest competency, must have coupled with it thorough education. The ministers of the gospel must occupy the highest point of intelligence in the Church. "Ignorance in the pulpit," one has said, "is a preposterous absurdity in itself, and should never be encouraged nor even *tolerated* in the Lutheran Church in this land and century." Truth, it has been justly remarked, is prejudiced by illiterate preachers, as religion is divested of its beauty by fanatical excitement. One learned gospel preacher of vigorous thought, cultivated taste and correct elocution, exerts a wider and more permanent influence than a host of others of a different stamp. The

Church should, therefore, beware of encouraging, fostering, or in any way inducing habits of defective pulpit preparation, and also of the admission of even partially educated men into the ministry. The distinguished Usher said, "It will take all our learning to make things plain." *Want* of learning often makes plain things hard to be understood. And if "an ungodly ministry is the deepest calamity, the greatest curse which can come upon a Church, I do not know, but that an ignorant ministry should perhaps rank as next in the order of evils." To be competent, our ministers must be intellectually qualified for their work. We do not simply mean that they must have at least a common share of intellectuality, but that which they have, must be trained, cultivated—they must have learning. "We do not want education without natural talent, but talent educated."

The mission of the Church is to educate, to teach. "Go teach." St. Paul says, "The servant of the Lord *must be apt to teach.*" The twelve were under the immediate tutorship of the divine Lord for three years and a half, during which time he taught them the things pertaining to the kingdom, and then endowed them with the gift of tongues, and the special power of the Holy Ghost. Take also the case of Paul, who was educated in the famous schools of Tarsus, and sat at the feet of Gamaliel, the distinguished Jewish rabbi. Take Paul's companions; Timothy, who had known the Scriptures from childhood; Apollos, "a learned man," son of prophecy, or Paul's instructions about the selections of ministers, "apt to teach," "not a novice," "able by sound doctrine to exhort and convince the gainsayers." Or, listen to his sharp and pungent rebukes against ignorance, shallowness, prating and vain babblings; in all these we have both precept and example for the highest professional training for the ministry, which can never be gainsaid, but must guide us to the end of time. In many respects an ignorant clergy, however pious it may be, is rather worse than none at all. The more the empty head glows and burns, the more hollow and thin and dry it grows. "The knowledge of the priest," said St. Francis de Sales, "is the eighth sacrament of the Church."

No dwarfish mind, therefore, can fill up the measure of the

Spirit's requirement when He declares of the preacher, that he "must be apt to teach." The grandeur of the objects to be gained, and the forces to be encountered, demand a *vigorous* ministry; and God in his providence, has demonstrated its necessity, for all the most important enterprises of his Church have been confided to men of massive and vigorous intellects. From Moses and Aaron, through the series of the prophets and apostles, down to the great minds that wielded the forces of the Reformation, ability and learning were prominent characteristics, and the selection of such men shows the view of the Almighty in reference to this department of his glorious operations. The antagonism of principalities and powers, demands all the skill and power of large, cultivated and sanctified intellect. The systematic and wide-spread infidelity of the age demands such a ministry. Never was the strength of the enemy, in the stratagems, boldness, energy and malignity of his opposition to the gospel, more clearly exhibited than now. To expose his sophistries, to silence his blasphemies, and rescue the deluded millions from his snares, calls for the best talent that our youthful membership affords.

Then, let us continue to educate, and thus follow in the footsteps of our fathers.

Nothing is surer than this, that the Christian denomination which neglects to provide for a thoroughly educated ministry dooms itself to weakness and insignificance. Intellectual superiority is power, and gives the ministry and Church *controlling* power in matters of morality and religion. It confers leadership and commands respect. If you would have a competent ministry, select young men whom God has designed for the work; furnish their minds with discipline and knowledge; then educate them for their calling. Let them be thoroughly grounded in Christian doctrine. Give them a critical knowledge of the Scriptures; let them learn God's teachings in the external and internal history of the Church; let them receive instruction and counsel from those mature in the knowledge and experience of ministerial and pastoral duties; and let them go forth in God's name, and put on the armor which the fathers are putting off.

To say that a young man can learn these things better by living with a pastor than at a theological seminary, is like saying that one can become a better civil or military engineer by practicing the art with another, than by studying mathematics. "All professional education is two-sided, theoretical and practical, and the latter element is founded on the former." Both are necessary. What sort of Hebraists and Biblical interpreters should we have, if our pastors, weary and exhausted with their parochial labors, were to do all the teaching? How would our young ministers be prepared to grapple with the fundamental questions which a secret or an avowed infidelity is industriously forcing upon the public attention every day? They are set for the defence, as well as the proclamation, of the gospel. Surely this is not a time in which the Church can dispense with heavy artillery, when that of the enemy is pointed against her from every hill-top. Who are the men that now stand on the walls of Zion with sword girded on, and spear and shield in hand? Who are the chosen champions of the Church and the defenders of the faith? Who translate our Scriptures, write our books, prepare our commentaries, and contribute the strong articles to our reviews? Who discuss the fundamental religious questions of the day, both in great assemblies, and in the religious press? There is but one answer: the ripest scholars and the ablest men that can be found. The labors of this class of men, their power of working in centres of influence with superior energy, and of diffusing sound views of truth with masterly skill cannot be dispensed with.

These three things, then, will add to the competency of the ministry: To sift more carefully the material offering itself, lest some run who are not called; to seek from God a new baptism of the Holy Ghost, that the men may possess sterling piety, and be girded and fitted by God himself; to do better work, if possible, in training the material selected, that these young men come to the end of their preparation neither weaklings nor novices, but well qualified for valiant work in the kingdom of God. And these three things, being in the Church's power, become her present, solemn and *imperative* duty.

THE CONCLUSION.

In order that still more glorious results may be realized through the system of what is known as Beneficiary Education, we must uphold and perfect the system, if possible, more and more. This cause, as well as the Church at large, would be better served by consigning to the waste basket parts of some articles that appear, now and then, in our Church papers, breathing contempt for this heaven-owned system. If some who hold the position of leaders in the host of Israel, discourage this good cause, what may we expect from the rank and file? We have had enough this long time, of the cry of "self-sacrifice" and "self-reliance"—why not also say "*self-torture?*"—as the way to help young men into the ministry. We never did think that the greatest amount of piety and sterling worth had been achieved by trying on how little a man can live, and thus show his love for God and pluck for his calling by first of all breaking down his health.

Beneficiary Education is not intended to supplant any of the Christian virtues, but to render sufficient aid to assist in the right cultivation of them. The Church has been repaid a hundred fold for all the help given young men while studying for the ministry. We cannot afford, therefore, to discourage this good cause. We stultify ourselves if we do, and are inconsistent. The great majority of our ministers have come, and are still likely to come, from the ranks of the poor, or from those in only moderate circumstances. Hence the need for help. And it will be a sad day for our Church when our pastors or people lose their interest in this branch of the Church's work, or lessen their gifts towards its support. God has provided the means and, as faithful stewards, we must utilize them for his glory.

In Nature, *co-operation* is one of God's appointed laws. Mighty and beneficent physical powers encompass us on every side, and offer themselves to our use; and to the accomplishment of a work in this realm we must *use* these powers. No petitioning can be substituted for honest labor here; and surely it ought not to astonish us that a similar law holds in the spiritual realm. Here also God works by means. We ought not to be surprised at being held accurately down in this realm as in

the other, to the exact conditions of benefit. We ought not to hope to evade the precise terms here more than there; to suppose that we can substitute one factor for another, prayer for labor, desire for endeavor, any more than in raising a hill of corn, or in turning the wheel of a mill. Therefore, when we pray the Lord that he would send forth laborers into the harvest, we must not forget also to *work* for this end. Our prayers can only be an abomination to the Lord if we pray for the sending of more laborers, and when they *are* sent, the Church refuses to render them the assistance needed to fit themselves for the holy office of the ministry. We must co-operate with God in our prayers by giving cheerfully and liberally of our means to this cause. And he whom the Church honors as her Founder with her service, at whose altars she bows in holy devotion, and from whom each member hopes to receive a crown and a palm of unfading glory, has set us a worthy example. His whole life was a giving, a willing sacrifice for us. He gave *himself;* and that not only when he died, but also when he lived. He gave himself for the Church which he loved. He gave himself in suffering, in sorrow, in hunger, in weariness, in pain, in solitude, in public, in stripes, in buffetings, in scoffings, in mockings, in tears, in crucifixion and in blood.

And not until the Christian people come up more nearly to the full measure of their duty in this matter, will the Church look "forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners." The blessed Lord pleads by all the shining marks of his love, for means and substantial sympathy, to help to qualify men who will enter the sacred office and stand up and speak his truth in his name, and build up his kingdom in the world. Benefaction multiplies its means, like the widow's oil. Contributions to this good cause will open fresh lips to call perishing souls to the blessed Saviour. The true philosophy—the word of the infallible Teacher—tells us that "it is more blessed to give than to receive." And we may, if we will, verify its truth in our own experience, and make our life flow down to the sea of eternity like a bright sunny stream, singing as it goes, itself overhung and hidden, but its course

marked far and wide by the beautiful verdure which it nourishes by its waters.

Thus, by taking heed unto the word of the Lord, and the wise use of his means at our command, in material, mind and heart, the Church shall surely not fail in the duty to supply an adequate ministry—adequate, both in numbers and competency.

ARTICLE VIII.

DR. HODGE ON THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

By Prof. J. W. Richard, D. D., Wittenberg College, Springfield, O.

During the Winter of 1885–6 Dr. A. A. Hodge, the distinguished professor of didactic and polemic theology in Princeton Theological Seminary, delivered a course of lectures in Philadelphia on various important subjects of theology. The lectures, which were regarded as very able and as admirably adapted to the religious wants of the times, were fully reported, cotemporaneously with their delivery, in two Presbyterian papers, and were extensively copied and favorably noticed by the Christian press of the country. In the Summer of 1886 seven additional lectures were prepared for a shorter course. These, owing to the sudden and premature death of the author, were never delivered. But in May of the present year both courses, nineteen lectures in all, were issued by the Presbyterian Board of Publication in a stout volume of 472 pages, with the title, Popular Lectures on Theological Themes. The lectures cover almost the entire field of theological discussion; and although they are intended to be *popular*, yet they contain a large amount of accurate learning, and present the results of profound and systematic thinking on some of the most important problems affecting human destiny. Nothing that Dr. Hodge has written shows him to better advantage as a Christian and as a theologian than do these lectures, which may be taken as fairly representative of the most conservative school of Calvinistic theology in this country. Dr. Hodge utters no uncertain sound.

He speaks with fulness of knowledge and with depth of conviction. His mode of thought, his feeling, all the manifestations of his religious life, are thoroughly and avowedly Calvinistic; and yet he is thoroughly and avowedly independent as a thinker and writer. He is not tied absolutely to the system which he expounds and defends. Hence these lectures have a permanent and general value for the common Christian faith. The Romanist, the Anglican, and the Lutheran each will find much in this volume which he can endorse. Especially will the Lutheran be interested in the tenth lecture, THE PERSON OF CHRIST, in which the author sharply distinguishes between the Lutheran and Reformed doctrines on this vital theme, and yet in the end reaches and enunciates conclusions which sound remarkably like the Lutheran doctrine.

We make the following continuous extract for examination and review:

I. As to the Incarnation.

1. Substance is that which has objective existence, permanence and power. Attributes are the active powers of their respective substances, and are inseparable from them. Only a divnie substance can have divine attributes. Only a human substance can have human attributes. In the Godhead the one infinite divine Substance exists in the form of three equal Persons.

2. In the Incarnation the second Person of this Trinity established a personal union between itself and a human soul and body. These substances remain distinct, and their properties or active powers are inseparable from each substance respectively.

3. The union between them is not mechanical, as that between oxygen and nitrogen in our air; neither is it chemical as that between oxygen and hydrogen when water is formed; neither is it organic, as that subsisting between our hearts and our brains; but it is a union more intimate, more profound and more mysterious than any of these. It is *personal.* If we cannot understand the nature of the simpler unions, why should we complain because we cannot understand the nature of the most profound of all unions?

II. As to the *effects* of the incarnation.

1. The attributes of both natures belong to the one Person, which includes both.

2. The acts of both natures are the acts of the one Person.

3. The human nature is greatly exalted, and shares in the love, adoration and glory of the divine nature. It all belongs to the one Person.

4. The human attributes of our Redeemer are the organ of his divine Person, and are through the divinity rendered virtually inexhaustible and ubiquitously available for us. When you put your babe to bed and leave him to go your own way to a distant place you say, 'Love, fear not; Jesus will be with you while I am gone.' You know Jesus will be with you also at the same time, and with all believers. By this you do not mean simply that Christ's divinity will be with you and the babe. You mean that the Person who is very man as well as very God will be with you both. You want his human love and sympathy as well as his divine benevolence. If he were a mere man, he could be only at one place at one time, and his attention and sympathy would soon be overwhelmed by our demands. But he is at once God and man, and as such, in the wholeness and fulness of both natures, he is inexhaustible and accesible by all believers in heaven and on earth at once and forever.

The best illustration of this mystery is afforded by the union of soul and body in the unity of our own persons. The body is matter, the soul is spirit. Matter and spirit are incompatible, as far as we understand, as incompatible as divinity and humanity. Matter is inert, extended and the vehicle of force. Spirit is spontaneous, inextended and the generator of force. Yet they form in us, under certain circumstances, one person. This is the person of the soul, not of the body, as shown before. The soul by this union is virtually confined to and extended in space, for wherever the body is, there the soul lives and feels through their union. The body, which is of itself inert and dead, is through its union with the soul palpitating with life, throbbing with feelings and instinct with energy.

Every act of each nature is also the act of the one Person, and both natures concur in our actions, organic and voluntary. Even digestion is possible to the body only through the indwell-

ing of the soul. But in all our higher actions, when the orator speaks or when the singer pours forth his soul in melody, both soul and body penetrating each other, yet distinct, constituting one person, yet unconfused,—both soul and body act together inseparably. As human voice and instrument blend in one harmony, as human soul and body blend in each act of feeling, thought or speech, so, as far as we can know, divinity and humanity act together in the thought and heart and act of the one Christ.

I adore a Christ who is absolutely one, who is at the same time pure, unmixed, unchanged God, and pure, unmixed, unchanged man, and whose Person in its wholeness and fulness is available throughout all space and throughout all time to those who trust him and love his appearing. pp. 230–3.

On what Dr. Hodge says under the head, "As to the Incarnation," we remark only that he has treated the subject with great clearness and philosophical accuracy, and in entire harmony with the historical faith of the Church. Doubtless Greeks, Romanists, Lutherans and Reformed would say, He has stated our faith exactly.

Under the second head, "As to the *effects* of the Incarnation," Dr. Hodge, it seems to us, has approximated, both in doctrine and in form of statement, very near to the historical and confessional position of the Lutheran Church in her doctrine of the Person of Christ; and in so doing, he has departed correspondingly from historical Calvinism.

Under this head, the *effects* of the Incarnation, Dr. Hodge treats a subject which in theology is technically known as the *Communicatio Idiomatum*, or the Participation of Attributes. His first proposition is: "The attributes of both natures belong to the one Person, which includes both." Remarkably similar is the statement in the Lutheran Form of Concord. "In the first place, since there are in Christ two distinct natures, which, in their essences and properties, are neither changed nor confounded, and yet the two natures have but one person: those properties which belong only to one nature are attributed not to that nature only as if separated, but to the whole person (which

is at the same time God and man), whether called God or man." *Sol. Dec.*, Art. VIII. We venture to say that the most strongly confessional Lutheran in the world would find no fault with Dr. Hodge's statement. To a divine nature belong only divine attributes; to a human nature belong only human attributes. But Christ, who according to the Lutheran statement "is at the same time both God and man;" who according to Dr. Hodge "embraced in his Person two distinct natures, the divine and the human;" has accordingly two distinct sets of attributes; that is, this "one Person" whether he be called God or man, is omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent, infinite; has a body and soul, can move from place to place, can suffer and die; that is, all the attributes which belong respectively to each nature *belong* to the "one person" which includes both natures, and consequently includes all the attributes of both natures, since attributes are inseparable from their natures or substances. This is all contained in Dr. Hodge's proposition, which is very like the statement in Dietrich's Catechism: "The properties of the natures are ascribed to the whole person."

Dr. Hodge's second proposition is: "The acts of both natures are the acts of the one Person." This perfectly agrees with the Lutheran doctrine on the subject: "The second kind (*communicatio idiomatum*) has respect to the office of Christ, where the person acts and operates, not in, with, through, or according to one nature only; but on the contrary, in, with, according to and through both natures; or as the Council of Chalcedon says: '*Each nature does or performs whatever belongs to each with communication of the other.*'"—*Form of Concord*, Art. VIII The point of agreement between Dr. Hodge and the Lutheran Symbol is here: It is the "one person" who acts, and not each nature *per se*. The Lutheran Symbol as quoted above makes this very clear; and Dr. Hodge equally so when he says farther on: "As human soul and body blend in each act of feeling, thought and speech, so, as far as we can know, divinity and humanity act together in the thought and heart and act of the one Christ." When the one Christ, therefore, performs an act of omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence, the divinity and humanity blend in the performance of that act. When "the one Christ" suffers

and dies, the "divinity and humanity act together." These conclusions are inevitable from the premises.

That is, the human nature of Christ, which of itself and according to its own essence is not omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent, shares the omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence of the divine nature by reason of the personal union established between itself and the divine substance. Likewise the divine nature, which in itself and according to its essence, is impassible and immortal, becomes partaker of the sufferings and death which are inflicted on the human nature, for both "divinity and humanity act together in the act of the one Christ;" or as Dr. Hodge beautifully puts it, p. 220: "The same 'I' possessed glory with the Father before the world was, and laid down his life for the sheep." It must be so; otherwise we are redeemed by the death and sufferings of a human nature, and since the human nature of Christ is impersonal (see Dr. Hodge's Commentary on Confession of Faith, p. 195), we would be redeemed by an impersonal human nature. The Lutheran symbol expresses it in this way: "Because the divine and human natures in Christ constitute one person, Scripture, on account of the personal union, ascribes all that to the divine nature which befalls the human, and, in turn, all to the human, which belongs to the divine nature." * * "It is the person itself which does and suffers all these things, *this*, indeed, according to this nature, and *that* according to the other nature."—F. C., Art. VIII.

In entire disharmony with Dr. Hodge's whole argument are the following confessional and dogmatic statements of the older Calvinists: "We can *merely verbally* predicate of God what belongs to the human nature, and of man what belongs to the divine nature."—*Admonitio Neastadiensis.* "It is not valid to infer a personal union from the assumption of the human nature into the personality of the Logos."—*Wendelin.* Beza declared that the Logos is united with the human nature as Antwerp is united to the sea, as a line touches a circle at one point, as the soul of a man is united with his feet. Sadeel (author of the Gallic Confession after a model prepared by Calvin), Danæus, and Peter Martyr, all join in the opinion that the hypostatic

union is correctly defined by *sustentatio** *et gestatio* of the human nature by the divine, and that the Logos could so dwell *in carne* as to be whole also *extra carnem.*† No one certainly who reads Dr. Hodge's tenth chapter, and especially that part of it now under review, will accuse him of any such superficial and dualistic notions about the personal union as those held by the older Calvinists, for he declares that this is the "most profound of all unions," and that the "divinity and humanity act together in the thought and heart and act of the one Christ," which would not be the case if the Logos dwelt at any time wholly *extra carnem*, that is, outside of the assumed humanity.

Dr. Hodge's third proposition is: "The human nature is greatly exalted, and shares in the love, adoration and glory of the divine nature. It all belongs to the one Person." This is what is known as the *genus majestaticum.* In the Form of Concord it is expressed as follows: "The human nature of Christ, because of its personal union with the divine nature, has received over and above its natural, essential, and permanently inherent human properties, also special, high, great, supernat-

---

*"We affirm that the humanity receives from the Logos only sustenance (*sustentatio*)"—*Mompelgart Col.* Maresius in exegesis of the Belgic Confession, as quoted by Carpzov in Isagoge p. 181, says: "The Son of God assumed a human nature into unity of Person, although its own subsistence and the divine hypostasis were not communicated to it, but after the human nature was assumed into the divine, it existed in it, as it were, a part of it and as an inseparable adjunct, and is sustained and limited by the divine, as a great growing tree nourishes, sustains and matures a graft which is inserted into it."

†The Lutheran and Reformed theologians alike use the words *caro*, *natura humana*, *homo*, for human nature. (See Vulgate, Joan. I., 1 *Et verbum caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis*). "The whole divine nature is in the human, and it is also wholly without the human nature." —*Zanchius.* "The whole hypostasis of the Logos is at a place where the caro does not exist."—The *Herborn Theologians.* "The Logos identical and whole is within and without his body."—*Sohnius in ex. Augs. Con.* "The divine nature of Christ is not in the assumed human nature in such a way that he is not also outside of it."—*Wendelin.* "The hypostasis of the Logos, properly speaking, was not communicated to the human nature, that is, not imparted to it, but it subsists by appropriation, as the branch subsists in the tree."—*Alstedt.*

ural, inscrutable, ineffable and heavenly prerogatives of majesty and glory, of power and might, over everything that is named not only in this world but also in the world to come." Art. VIII.

Farther on Dr. Hodge says: "I adore a Christ who is absolutely one; who is at the same time pure, unmixed, unchanged God, and pure, unmixed, unchanged man." By the words "adore" and "adoration," so *unqualifiedly* used, Dr. Hodge concedes all that is demanded by the predicates of the Lutherans, since only that which is supernatural, ineffable, yea, has divine attributes, is worthy of "adoration;" and Dr. Hodge, with that awful reverence for Deity which Calvinism inspires, was one of the last men on earth, who would adore a "man" who has not been made partaker of divine attributes; and yet in the case of Christ the object of his adoration is a "pure, unmixed, unchanged man;" however, not such a man in himself considered, but such a "pure, unmixed, unchanged man" as has in this case been greatly exalted, and made to share in the glory of the divine natnre.

In a course of pretty wide reading in Calvinistic symbolical and dogmatic theology, we do not remember to have met with anything on this subject so strong and *unqualified* as these statements of Dr. Hodge. They are stronger and more unqualified perhaps than the following from the Lutheran Hutter: "The humanity of Christ is to be adored, not separately on account of its nature and essence, but on account of the personal union;" and this from Gerhard: "Christ is to be adored by us not according to his divine nor according to his human nature only, but according to both natures, and the human nature is and is called adorable not *per se* and *ex se* on account of essential properties, because it does not subsist *per se*, and therefore is not to be adored *per se*." * * "With one and the same adoration Christ God and man is adored, because the hypostasis of both natures is one and undivided."—*Loci*, IV., Cap. xii., §ccxxxvi.

In striking contrast with Dr. Hodge are the Calvinists of the olden time: "The adoration of the human nature of Christ is horrible idolatry."—*Beza*. "It cannot be proved from Scripture that the human nature must be adored.—*Zanchius*. "Christ according to the humanity is not adored with religious worship."

—*Idem.* "Adoration belongs to the person, not to the humanity."—*Alting.** There can be no mistaking the difference between these statements and those of Dr. Hodge in the premises. But why should the human nature of Christ share in the love adoration and glory of the divine nature? Only because it has the personality of the Son of God communicated to it, has an uncreated divine subsistence, and is at the same time exalted to heavenly prerogatives of majesty and glory, of power and might.

In the fourth proposition Dr. Hodge says: "The human attributes of the Redeemer are the organ of his divine Person, and are through the divinity rendered virtually inexhaustible and ubiquitously available for us." Here are three propositions which are remarkably like Lutheranism and as remarkably unlike historic Calvinism.

1. The human attributes are the organ of the divine Person. "There is and remains in Christ only one divine omnipotence,

---

*Very many of the old Calvinists distinguish between *totum Christum* and *totum Christi*. They declare that *totus Christus* must be adored and invoked, but not *totum Christi*, since adoration and invocation must not be directed to the human nature of Christ, but only to the Deity! *See Giesen's Calvinismus*. Danaeus Contra Chemnitzium says: "In the first place our doctrine must be briefly explained, namely, that totum Christum must be adored and invoked by us, lest we divide the person of Christ. But we do not properly direct adoration and invocation to *totum Christi*, nor confound the natures which in that union remain unconfounded. Our adoration and invocation are not properly and *per se* offered and directed to the human nature of Christ, but the Deity itself." And Wollebius, Professor at Basel: "Adoration * * not of the creature, but of God in created human nature." Lutheran theologians make no such distinction. When they adore *totum Christum* they adore *totum Christi*, but they never adore the human nature *per se*, or because of any natural or essential attributes of its own. Thus Quenstedt: "The human nature of Christ in the personal union, or subsisting in the person of the Son of God, and become partaker of divine majesty and glory *per unionem hypostaticam*, is to be worshiped and adored with one and same adoration with the divine nature of the Logos." Compare, with reference both to language and sentiment, Dr. Hodge's third proposition, and his "I adore a Christ who is absolutely one," &c. All the adoration belongs to the one Person, and is one in act, one in number, and one in degree. Such is the Lutheran position, and such is unquestionably the meaning of the language of Dr. Hodge.

power, majesty and glory, which are the property of the divine nature alone. But all these shine forth, exhibit and manifest themselves, fully, yet most freely in, with and through the assumed exalted human nature of Christ.—*Form of Concord*, Art. VIII. Danaeus writes against Chemnitz: "The human nature of Christ contributed not more in working miracles than did the human nature of the apostles in the miracles performed by them." Also: "The divine power of Christ does not use the co-operation of human assistance in performing divine works." The authors of the Admon. Neast. say: "We deny that Christ performs all divine works by the human nature as by an organ. For he does not hear, preserve, and give the Holy Spirit by his humanity; much less by hands and feet."

2. The human attributes are rendered through the divinity virtually inexhaustible. Farther on he says that in "the wholeness and fulness of both natures Christ is inexhaustible and accessible by all believers in heaven and on earth at once and forever." By human attributes in this case Dr. Hodge means Christ's human "love," "sympathy" and "attention." It is difficult to understand how these can be "virtually inexhaustible," or simply, "inexhaustible," unless they be "virtually" or simply, infinite; not infinite *per se*, but rendered so through the infinite divine nature which has established a personal union between its substance and the substance in which these attributes inhere. And we believe that Dr. Hodge had already laid the foundation for this conclusion when he said: "The human nature shares in the love, adoration and glory of the divine nature," that is, shares in them to the extent that in their wholeness and fulness they can *never* be exhausted by all the saints in heaven and on earth. And it will not do here to fall back on the philosopheme: The finite is not capable of the infinite. That is not in Dr. Hodge's premises. Moreover, it is doubtful whether the Christian consciousness will ever rest satisfied with a human love, sympathy and attention from Christ, which it does not conceive to be infinite—not necessarily such in the *absolute* and *philosophical* sense of the word infinite, but in that practical *efficacious* sense which will meet all the demands of all creatures; and it is certain that the Form of Concord does not demand

more than this, and many of our greatest dogmaticians have contended for no more, and have especially cautioned against the use of abstract and philosophical terms when treating of this subject. *See Baier, Compend*, Part III., Cap. II., Sec. I., §21.

3. The human attributes are rendered ubiquitously available for us.

Why ubiquitously available? Evidently because ubiquitously present, since attributes can no more avail where they are not than when they are not; and if the human attributes of Christ are ubiquitously present, then also is his human nature ubiquitously present, his human soul and body; because "attributes are the active powers of their respective substances, and are inseparable from them." No other conclusion is possible from Dr. Hodge's premises. His language is wholly with reference to that which is objective in Christ. He does not even hint at human subjectivism; that is, the office of faith in lifting the believer's soul into heaven, there to receive the love, sympathy and attention of Christ. His beautiful and touching reference to the babe and parent is the purest absurdity on any other supposition than that of the real presence of the human nature of Christ. "You do not mean that Christ's divinity will be with you and the babe. You mean that the person who is very man as well as very God will be with you both." "You know Jesus will be with you also and with all believers."

If this, taken in connection with the *inexhaustibility* and *accessibility* of the wholeness and fulness of both natures in Christ throughout all time and space, teach not the *omnipresence* of the human nature of Christ (not omnipresent *per se* and in the abstract, for it is *never* abstracted from the divine nature) then at least it teaches a *multipresence* which extends beyond all human conception and is therefore virtually and efficaciously an omnipresence. Hear now the confessional and dogmatic statements of the older Calvinists: "We do not teach that Christ according to his human nature, is yet in the world, and so in every place." —*Second Helvetic Confession*, Chap. XI. (Dr. Briggs of the Union Theological Seminary, New York, in Biblical Study, p. 108, pronounces this confession "the most honored in the Reformed

Church"). But this is just what Dr. Hodge does teach, namely that Christ according to his human nature is yet in the world. The human nature of Christ is with the babe, its parent and all believers :—not separate and apart from the divine nature but in personal union with it. "Christ is true Man and true God: according to his human nature he is now not upon earth; but according to his Godhead, majesty, grace and spirit, he is at no time absent from us."—*Heidelberg Cat.*, Quest. 47. This of course sunders the natures of Christ, and flatly denies the presence of his human nature on earth in any manner or form. No one can so understand Dr. Hodge.

"As the body of Christ while he was on earth, was absent from heaven, so now we believe that that same body since the ascension, is absent from the earth, and, carried above all heavens, is circumscribed there."—*Beza.* "Christ according to his human nature is absent from us by a distance as great as that from the earth to beyond all heavens."—*Beza.* Dr. Hodge, were he living, might possibly say that he did not use the word "body." But in his Commentary on the Confession of Faith, he tells us that Christ the Son of God "took a human soul and body into personal union with himself;" and "the wholeness and fulness" of that human nature which is "ubiquitously available" and "accessible throughout all space and all time," must include a body. The Lutheran faith is: "According to and with his assumed human nature, he (Christ) *can* be present and is present wherever he pleases;* particularly he is present with

*No Lutheran symbol teaches the absolute *omnipresence* of the human nature of Christ: Baier says, the words we have just quoted from the F. C. "manifestly describe that omnipresence not as *absolute*, as an immediate presence with all creatures, without efficacious operation, but as *modified*, or as joined with an efficacious operation and in accordance with the demands of that universal dominion which he exercises according to both natures."—*Compend* III. II. I., §20. He refers to the Saxon Definition: "Christ the Theanthropos now in the state of exaltation according to both natures is present to all creatures, but graciously to all the pious on earth, and gloriously to all angels and elect in heaven." Quenstedt maintains a substantial, efficacious and relative presence, that is, such as the exigencies of his kingdom require, and rejects the

his Church and congregation on earth, * * not only according to his divinity, but also according to and with his assumed human nature."—*Form of Concord*, Art. VIII.

We invite the reader to compare all that Dr. Hodge says on this point now under consideration, first, with the symbolical and dogmatic deliverances of his own Church, then with our quotation from the Form of Concord, and thus decide for himself with which Dr. Hodge more nearly agrees. It will be found that Dr. Hodge does not even hint that he believes in a Christ whose divine nature may exist or ever exists *extra carnem*, or whose "human nature is not now upon earth." His Christ is "absolutely one," "pure, unmixed, unchanged God, and pure, unmixed, unchanged man," whose two natures penetrate each other far more profoundly than human soul and body. This is exactly the Christ of the Lutheran theology, whereas, it has even obtained symbolical statement in the Calvinistic theology that the divine nature since the incarnation may exist *extra carnem*, and that the human nature is not now in the world. The *Admonitio Neostadiensis* says: "The same Logos exists in his entirety both within and without the assumed body, though he exists in a peculiar manner in that body. He is by no means confined within the narrow limits of the body nor does he carry it everywhere with him." How differently Luther as quoted in F. C: "Where you put God, there you must put the humanity (of Christ): they can not be sundered and riven; it is *one* person, and the humanity is not to be separated." But that the Lutheran theology may guard itself against being misunderstood, it rejects the following errors: "That the human nature in Christ, in the same way as the divinity, as an infinite essence and by an essential virtue or property of its nature, IS PRESENT EVERYWHERE." "That the humanity of Christ is locally extended in all places of heaven and earth, an affirmation which cannot be made with truth even of divinity."—*Form Concord*, Art. VIII. But perhaps the most remarkable thing in Dr.

---

notion of a philosophical or abstract presence. See Schmid's Dogmatic (Hay and Jacobs) pp. 355–6. "The true designation of the Lutheran doctrine, on this point, would be, 'The *personal omnipresence* of the human nature of Christ.'" *Conservative Ref.*, p. 496.

Hodge's tenth chapter is his declaration of the *ubiquitous* availability of the human attributes of the person of Christ, which upon his own statement that attributes are inseparable from their substances, and upon the universally accepted principle that no being, substance, nature, can act where it is not, consequently likewise its attributes, clearly implies the *ubiquitous* presence of those attributes, and consequently the *ubiquitous* presence of their substance. The words "ubiquitous," "ubiquitously," as applied to the glorified human nature of Christ, the old Calvinists called *monstrum figmentum, impium monstrum, Helenam ubiquitariam.* Here is a son of these old monsters using the very word they rejected, and applying it in a way that they rejected; for he tells us with the utmost objectivity of statement, that the wholeness and fullness of both natures of Christ are accessible to all believers in heaven and on earth at one and the same time—that the whole Christ is present with the unconscious babe in one place and with the mother in a distant place. In a word the Christ of Dr. Hodge, "who is absolutely one," "pure God and pure man," whose divinity and humanity penetrate each other far more profoundly than human soul and body, is to all practical intents and purposes exactly the Christ of the Lutheran symbol: "Namely, that according to and with this assumed human nature, he (Christ) *can* be and *is* present wherever he pleases, and particularly that he is present with his Church and congregation on earth, as Mediator, Head, King, and High Priest; not divided, or only in part, but the whole Christ, to whom pertain both natures, the divine and the human; not only according to his divinity, but also according to and with his assumed human nature, according to which he is our brother. * * * And indeed, he instituted his Holy Supper for a more certain assurance and confirmation of the fact that, according to the nature by which he has flesh and blood, he will be with us, will dwell in us, will operate in us, and be efficacious."—*Form of Concord,* Art. VIII.

Even in the application of his doctrine of the Person of Christ to the Lord's Supper, Dr. Hodge comes nearer to the Lutheran position than did even Calvin himself,* with whose views Lu-

*Calvin's view of the nature and method of Christ's presence in the

ther was fairly well pleased, and with whom he declared he could have settled the whole prolix controversy had with Œcolampadius and Zwingli. While holding on to and repeating Calvin's interpretation of the words of Christ, "This is my body," he nevertheless rejects Calvin's *dynamical presence*, and maintains a true real presence of the entire Person of Christ, divinity and humanity, in the Eucharist at the time and place of celebration. He says: "But before we can go any farther we must answer this question: Is Christ really, truly, personally present with us in the sacrament? Do we therein covenant and commune with him in person, touch to touch, immediately and really, or is this only a show, a symbol of something absent and different from what it seems?

"The gross perversion of the Romanists and Ritualists, who have made it altogether a question of the local presence of Christ's flesh and blood, has occasioned much confusion of thought and many prejudices on the subject. Nevertheless, as a matter of fact, every believer knows that Christ *is* present in the sacrament—that he has, as a matter of fact, experienced his presence. If he is not present really and truly, then the sacra-

---

supper is comprehensively expressed in his Harmony of Matthew, Mark and Luke, Vol. III., p. 209 et seq. "Our minds must not be fixed on the earth, but must ascend upwards to the heavenly glory in which he dwells. For the body of Christ did not, by clothing itself with an incorruptible life, lay aside its own nature; and hence it follows that it is finite. But he has now ascended above the heavens, that no gross imagination may keep us occupied with earthly things. And certainly, if this mystery is heavenly, nothing could be more unreasonable than to draw down Christ to the earth, when, on the contrary, he calls us upwards to himself."—*Calvin Trans. Society Edition.* Our minds thus lifted up to heaven by faith, "we are fed with the *flesh and blood* of Christ," says Calvin in his Institutes. "Christ refreshes us with the eating of his flesh and the drinking of his blood."—Ib. Buddaeus in his Isagoge, p. 1283, says: "It has been observed by learned men that Calvin at the beginning agreed with our theologians on the doctrine of the Holy Supper; certainly he did not differ much from our doctrine." Certain it is that in 1539 he wrote of Zwingli: "I remember how profane is his doctrine of the sacraments."—See Gieseler's Ecc. Hist., Vol. IV., p. 415, n. 44. Some, however, have thought that later in life Calvin went over to Zwingli's views.

ment can have no interest or real value for us. It does not do to say that this presence is only spiritual, because that phrase is ambiguous. If it means that the presence of Christ is not something objective to us, but simply a mental apprehension or idea of him subjectively present to our consciousness, then the phrase is false. Christ as an objective fact is as really present and active in the sacrament as are the bread and wine or the minister or our fellow communicants by our side. If it means that Christ is present only as he is represented by the Holy Ghost, it is not wholly true, because Christ is one Person and the Holy Ghost another, and it is Christ whose Person is present. The Holy Ghost doubtless is co-active in that presence and in all Christ's mediatorial work, but this leads into depths beyond our possible understanding. It does not do to say that the divinity of Christ is present while his humanity is absent, because it is the entire indivisible divine-human Person of Christ which is present. * * We need not speculate how it is that Christ, the whole God-man, body, soul and divinity, is present in the sacrament, but we are absolutely certain of the fact. He has promised it. We have hundreds of times experienced it. We can neither see his face nor hear his voice with our bodily senses; nevertheless, when we exercise faith, he, the whole Christ, speaks to us, and we hear him; we speak to him, and he hears us; he takes all we give him, he gives us and we receive all of himself. This is real, because he is present."—pp. 408 et seq.

There are at least three points, and those of the very highest practical value, on which Dr. Hodge agrees with the Lutheran position:

1. That the whole Christ, "body, soul and divinity" are personally present in the Eucharist.

2. That this presence occurs on earth in the act of communion, where, as Dr. Hodge says p. 410, "we have a personal appointment to meet our Lord."*

---

*The second Helvetic Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism, the two most widely received and influential of the Reformed creeds, declare, the former, that we must devote our minds to heaven in order to commune with and meet the body of Christ in the Supper; the latter,

3. That this presence is not a mere *adessentia* (nearness), but that it is accompanied with gracious activity, by which Christ *dwells in us, operates in us, is efficacious, (F. C.); speaks to us, hears us, gives us himself, and communicates his grace.* (Dr. Hodge.)

But as already intimated, Dr. Hodge does not agree with the Lutheran position *in toto.* He rejects the literal interpretation of the words, "This is my body," and likewise the Lutheran formulae that Christ's body is present *in, with,* and *under* the bread, and that the bread is the medium of communicating the body, and the wine the medium of communicating the blood of Christ—largely questions of the exegesis of the words of Christ in the gospels and of the words of Paul to the Corinthians. But the old philosophical objection which the Calvinists have urged as in their opinion fatal to the Lutheran exegesis and to the Lutheran doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, viz., that the body of Christ being definitely located and circumscribed at the right hand of God in heaven, cannot be present on earth,—this old objection which dominates the entire historical and confessional position of the Calvinists on this subject, opposes no barrier to the faith of Dr. Hodge, for he says: "We do know that he (Christ) is as fully and as really with us in the sacrament as the minister or the fellow-communicant sitting by our side. Face to face and heart to heart and hand to hand, he recognizes and speaks to us, and we recognize and speak to him; and when we speak he hears, and when he hears, his whole divine-human heart responds," p. 414; by which Dr. Hodge means "the entire indivisible divine-human Person of Christ," p. 409, and "maintains his unshaken faith, not in abstract, material flesh and blood, [nothing can be farther from the Lutheran doctrine than that it maintains the presence of abstract, material flesh and blood] but in the actual objective, effective presence with the believing communicant of the whole divine-human Person of Christ," p. 414; "immediately receiving into our souls, through faith, the actually-present Christ, his whole person and all the benefits his blood purchases." p. 415.

---

that we become partakers of the body and blood of Christ by the working of the Holy Ghost.

This is a great advance on the *allœosis* of Zwingli, and is far more philosophical than the *dynamical presence* of Calvin, inasmuch as the communion with Christ and his presence in the Eucharist occur on earth and not in heaven. Had such views been maintained by the Swiss at Marburg and by the Sacramentarians generally, history would have been spared the recital of much bitter controversy.

ARTICLE IX.

THE LATE GUSTAVUS SEYFFARTH, PH. D., D. D.

By Rev. William Hall, New York.

A neat pamphlet volume, entitled, "The Literary Life" of Dr. Seyffarth, "an Autobiographical Sketch," noting *in initio*, his memberships with numerous Scientific and Literary Societies in both Europe and America and his early Leipzig Professorship, has been published since his death, by Steiger & Co., New York, edited by Mr. Karl Knortz, who has also issued it in German, with additional biographical particulars.

This work bears a motto on its title page, taken from a quotation prefixed to one of the Doctor's books, from a Latin author, which well expresses his extraordinary diligence as a scholar both in his early and later years, viz: "*Puer multa tulit sudavit et alvit.*"

As the chief *cause d'être* of this publication, the editor remarks as follows: "The present sketch is published in accordance with the directions left in the last will of Dr. Seyffath, and is intended as a key to his numerous publications in the German, Latin and English languages, written by him from youth to old age, for which he desired to be alone responsible." To this we would add that the frontispiece of this volume is accompanied with a valuable engraved likeness of Dr. Seyffath, reproduced from one taken in the closing period of his long life, when disease had begun to make its mark, but which faithfully represents his deeply thoughtful, composed and expresive face. Underneath it, the editor has commendably placed a sentence

in German, found inscribed by Dr. Seyffarth on the front page of one of his principal works, that truly sets forth his profound religious feeling, which like a thread of gold ran through all the multitudinous studies and literary productions of the great Egyptologist and archæologist, viz:

"*O der Weisheit, die den Glauben aermer, und doch nicht selig macht.*"

A prefix to his autobiography, signed "G. S.," we also here quote as follows: "As scientific truths do not belong to a few seasons, but to all future time and the civilized world in general, it is a duty to remember in this respect, what Providence has done by the instrumentality of an old contemporary, during a period of over sixty years. It is true, the history of the literary works enumerated in the present aphoristic sketch has been already mentioned in "Brockhaus' Konversation Lexicon," "Picrev's Real Cyclopedie," "Vapereau's Dictionaire des Contemporaries," Appleton's and Johnson's Cyclopedias, Allibone's "Dictionary of Authors," etc., but as their statements are, in many respects, imperfect, and in many, erroneous, the following compendium may be excused. In reading the subsequent pages, it is to be borne in mind, that all dates B. C., cited therein, refer to the astronomical method of reaching the years, as the only true and practical one.—New York, 1881."

To this well-written preliminary, by Dr. Seyffarth, Mr. Knortz subjoins a criticism of his English composition, to which we cannot subscribe as correct, viz.: that "Dr. S. never acquired a full mastery of English," and, therefore, as his editor, he "has contented himself with making such *changes* as the rules of English grammar required." In regard to this, we have to say, that after the perusal of several MSS. of our respected friend, Dr. Seyffarth, in his own English, one of which was this very autobiographical sketch, we did not notice the least violation of "English *Grammar*." True, his style of writing in our language was not always quite idiomatic, and was naturally somewhat *Germanized* and *Latinized*, as also the terms he sometimes employed, but it is safe to say, that his English was far more English than *Carlyle's*, that his language was always scholarly, terse and fitting to the ideas he wished to express, and that he

wrote with equal vigor and clearness of thought. We, therefore, must regret that Mr. Knortz did not leave Dr. Seyffarth's English as he found it, intact and without change.

The "autobiographical" portion of this very valuable memoir and sketch of the Doctor's life, is, substantially, as follows:

"The author was born July 13th, 1796, at Uebigan, a Saxon village, near Torgau, in which his father, the Reverend Traugott August Seyffarth, Ph. D., D. D., was a minister of the Lutheran Church. Besides the regular instruction of the parochial school, he received private lessons from a young candidate of theology, in Latin and Greek, and made such progress that in his fourteenth year he was able to read several of the Latin classics and the New Testament in the original, and translate fluently from Latin and Greek into his native tongue. He then became an "alumnus" of "St. Afra," the so-called *Fürstenschule* at Meissen, near Dresden.

At the time of the Reformation there existed in Saxony three immensely rich monasteries, viz.: Grimma, Meissen, and Schulpforta, which were secularized and converted into *Gymnasia* by the pious Elector of Saxony, Frederick the Wise. The income of these institutions sufficed to pay the salaries of five professors and some other teachers, and to support from 90 to 150 pupils each. Every town in Saxony had the privilege of sending one or two boys of the age of fourteen to these places of learning and in this way the gifted son of the poorest family had an opportunity to receive a gratuitous academical education.

The buildings of the "St. Afra" School were surrounded with a high wall, the doors of which opened to the students only upon a written permit by the Rector. The instruction, though pre-eminently of a religious character, was such, that the Alumni of the first and second classes, were enabled to read and understand Plato, Sophocles, Pindar, Horace and Cicero, and fluently to write and speak Latin, the official vernacular of the professors and tutors. Many of the students of "St. Afra" afterwards occupied influential positions as professors of philology in the universities and gymnasia of Germany and of other countries.

In the year 1815, the author left Meissen with flattering tes-

timonials to study theology, being desirous however of learning all that might be worth knowing. He did not content himself with attending theological, philosophical and philological lectures, but also busied himself with the study of mathematics, astronomy, chemistry, botany, history, mineralogy, mechanics, drawing, music, and especially oriental languages. After four years he was made Artium Magister, Doctor of Philosophy, and Candidatus Reverendi Ministerii, and returned to "St. Afra" for the purpose of preparing himself for a theological professorship. In order to interpret the Old and New Testaments and to study their ancient versions, he learned all the languages into which the Holy Bible had been translated. From the conviction thus obtained that the pronunciation of the Greek and Hebrew letters ought to be modified, he gave to the press his work, "De Sonis Literarum Graecarum, &c.," in two books, with commentaries and tables, Leipsic 1824." And by defending his theory in a Latin disputation with members of the philosophical faculty, the author was honored with the privilege of delivering public lectures (1823). In the following year, Dr, Seyffarth, being the only person in the city familiar with *Coptic*, the fundamental language of Egyptian literature, was asked by the University to complete and edit Professor Spohn's work on Egyptology, which he accepted and thenceforth began his scientific career in that direction. In order to accomplish this difficult task, he visited, during the year 1826–1828, the public and private collections of Egyptian antiquities at Berlin, Vienna, Munich, Turin, Milan, Venice, Florence, Leghorn, Rome, Naples, Lyons, Paris, London, Oxford, Cambridge, Leyden and Amsterdam, and took copies of all important inscriptions, now constituting the writer's "Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca Manuscripta," a work of fifteen volumes royal folio, to be after his death the property of the New York Historical Library. In the year 1854, he resigned his Leipzig professorship and in 1856 emigrated to the United States, which has since become his second home. As some of his former pupils had founded at St. Louis, Mo., the so-called Concordia Collegium, a Theological Seminary, he was offered therein a professorship of archæology and cognate sciences, which he accepted, and for several years gave gratui-

tous instruction and lectures to the students. In 1859, however, he severed his connection with that institution and went to New York, where the Astor Library gave him ample opportunity for pushing his favorite studies. His writings since 1821, (chronologically enumerated in this book,) were published for the purpose of diffusing knowledge and refuting falsehood. They treat of the following subjects: Egyptian philology and palæography; the ancient astronomy of the Egyptians, Greeks, Romans and Cypriotes; universal history and chronology, especially of the Old and New Testaments, of the Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, Babylonians, Chinese, etc., Mythology, ancient geography, apologetics, etc."

Following this autobiographical introduction, under the head of "The key to Egyptian Literature," Dr. Seyffarth, presents a detailed account of former discoveries and failures in this field, and gives the history of the results of his own studies, with a full defence of them, and refutations of the antagonistic views of Champollion, Brugsch and others. The next chapter, which is entitled "TRIENNIAL RESEARCHES in Egyptian Museums and Public Libraries in Southern Germany, Italy, France, England and Holland," will richly repay the notice of every scholar, as will also the subsequent *résumé* upon, "The Astronomical Monuments of the Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, Cyprians, Indians, Mexicans, etc.

Other important sections of the work, are thus headed:

1. Manetho's Hyksos—The Israelites.
2. The New York Obelisk and the Pharaoh drowned in the Red Sea, 1866, B. C.
3. The age of the great Pyramids near Cairo.
4. The First Olympic Games, 777 B. C.
5. Greek, Babylonian and other Eclipses.
6. The Solar Months and Seasons of the Greeks.
7. Corrections of the present History of Greece.
8. Corrections of Babylonian, Assyrian, Median, and Persian, Histories.
9. Corrections of Chinese History.
10. Corrections of Roman History.
11. The Antiquity of Astronomy.

12, The World-period, the three World-ages, Yuges and Avatarus.

13. The Universality of the Deluge.
14. The origin of the Alphabet, 3446, B. C.
15. Alteration of the Primitive Alphabet.
16. The Origin of Egyptian Hieroglyphs.
17. Hebrew the Primitive Alphabet.
18. Laws governing the changes in all languages.
19. Chronology of the Old Testament.
20. Daniel's Seventy Weeks.
21. Chronology of the New Testament.
22. The Martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul.
23. Destruction of Jerusalem, 71 A. C.

This line of topics briefly described under their heads, exhibits the great originality, and rich research of Dr. Seyffarth's mind.

Under the final caption of "Bibliography," we find a Chronological catalogue of the products of his pen, from the years 1818 to 1882, to which is annexed a list of his unpublished manuscripts, or partially so, to the number of about thirty.

The "Appendix," of several pages consists of an article published in the New York Herald, at the time of his decease, which gives an account of his life, and works, and personal characteristics, of considerable merit, though without a full degree of justice to his extraordinary rank as a scholar, and a sincere devotee of religious truth and duty. In this relation Mr. Knortz, himself does not seem to have duly appreciated the worth of the truly great and Christian scholar.

Soon after his arrival in New York from Germany in 1856, Dr. Seyffarth devoted himself very assiduously to the study of Dr. Abbott's rare Egyptological Museum in that city, long since deposited in the Historical Library rooms, and delivered lectures in connection with it. The same year he published a duodecimo work, with the title: "Summary of Recent Discoveries in Biblical Chronology, Universal History, and Egyptian Archæology, with special reference to Abbott's Egyptian Museum, together with a translation of the First Sacred Book of the ancient Egyptians." This work contains a condensed but graphic sketch of his own Egyptological discoveries and researches, to

which is attached a very valuable chronological table from the beginning of history to the year 130 A. C. It at once introduced the author, and most favorably, to the learned world in America, and is a lasting monument of his profound scholarship and enthusiastic devotion to the interests of historical and religious truth. The preface of this volume, well deserving a second edition, thus devotedly closes: "May the Lord make these pages subsidiary to the good of His Church!"

That this was the dominant desire of his heart, through his best years *ad finem*, there is no reason to doubt. It was this motive, which led him, during his brief service of two or three years in Dansville, N. Y., shortly after leaving St. Louis, to attempt the establishment of a Lutheran Theological Seminary in that beautiful and health-breathing village. The enterprise was unsuccessful, although he spent several thousand dollars in the effort, and chiefly on a building which thus became comparatively worthless.

But he seems to have been true to his literary habits while in that place and to have enjoyed his residence there. A lady who represents the family in Dansville in which he was most intimate, and who was one of his subsequent correspondents, Miss N. P. McCartney, has favored us with the following interesting account of his Dansville life.

"While here, he lived a very secluded life. His habit was to take a walk of about two miles every morning. The remainder of his time he devoted to writing, studying sixteen hours out of the twenty-four, the year round, with the exception of a few weeks in Winter, when he visited New York in order to consult works in the Astor Library. One peculiarity in a man of his years, which I do not remember to have seen in print, was his not wearing *glasses*, and I think he informed us that he had never used them. He made few acquaintances. It seemed to give him, as it certainly did us, great pleasure to drive with us occasionally on Sunday, and spend a few hours after dinner in social converse. Music was to him a delight, and I was always called upon to sing for him some airs from "Adelaide," which was a favorite with him. I am not aware that he visited any other family than ours during his residence in Dansville."

The last ten years of Dr. Seyffarth's life were spent at his own lodgings in the private family of an excellent lady, a Mrs. Gordon, of the Presbyterian Church, who, with her brother, Dr. Wilson, a physician, (whose professional services Dr. Seyffarth, when ill, always appreciated) resides in Park Avenue, New York, within a short walk of the Metropolitan Museum, in the Central Park. With this family he always bore a happy reputation for his regular, quiet and devout mode of life. His proximity to that great museum, so wonderful a treasure-house of Egyptian, Cyprian and Assyrian antiquity, enabled Dr. Seyffarth to make it a frequent resort in the pursuit of his favorite studies, and it is very certain that no other person in America could better realize their value or interpret their meaning. And when that stupendous monument of the past, the Obelisk, was brought over to this country from its original home at the mouth of the Nile as the noble gift to the city and Central Park, by the late William H. Vanderbilt, Dr. Seyffarth was the first decipherer of its mystic inscriptions and the only man, in our land and, probably, in the world, who was capable of their true interpretation. It was interesting and touching to see this venerable old man, bent under the weight of years, on his almost daily walks in that magnificent Park, or peering into the remains of ancient art and history in the Museum. Never again shall such a prodigy of learning, and renowned aged scholar, so much at home amid those relics of the remote past, be seen there. His feet were found in the ways of "righteousness" and so the Master whom he served crowned his "hoary head" with honor, although the merit of his services in the cause of truth has never yet been fully owned by his fellow-men. But he lived largely above the honor that cometh from man, and in the midst of increasing infirmities, and under some trials known to but few, he maintained a manly self-respect, his early trust in God, and, when once asked by a friend, as to his highest hope, could quietly and modestly reply: "*I know that my Redeemer liveth.*"

Dr. Seyffarth took much interest in a little Lutheran congregation near his later New York residence, left it some money, and was the superintendent of its Sunday school until two or three years before his death. Within about two years of that

event his eye-sight gave out almost entirely, so as to inhibit all further progress in study and the use of his pen, which was a great affliction to him, as his mental powers were still so active, and he had such inexhaustible stores of knowledge to give to the world in its struggles with error. But he had been too long in the school of patience to murmur at this appointment.

Dr. Seyffarth was naturally a man of warm affections and, when well, no one was more friendly and cordial in manner. The freezing coldness of the rationalistic theology had early repelled him, and orthodoxy and its friends were thenceforth held in his warmest embrace.

Toward the close of his life he evinced his fidelity to former bonds of friendship by sending to various persons tokens of his affectionate remembrance, some of which were articles of much curious interest and value. His correspondence had been very extensive, and a large volume of manuscript letters from his former literary associates, and from persons of eminence as scholars, were on his shelves. What has become of them? It was his, so to speak, repeatedly expressed *nuncupative* will, that *all* his literary effects, should go to the New York Historical Society.

Before closing this imperfect tribute to the memory of Dr. Seyffarth, we would add the interesting fact that as a professor of Oriental languages at Leipzig, he was the instructor of Dr. Delitzsch in Hebrew, in which he is now *facile princeps*, among the learned, and also, that the scholar was never ashamed of his instructor.

Dr. Seyffarth had no relative in this country, and very few in Germany survived him, although he made several inquiries after his kindred there. His mother was Johanna Dorothea, *nee* Hertel, and she lived to a great age.

We cannot but hope, that in this his adopted home, some true archæologist may arise, able to grapple the problem of Egyptology, with the light of his immense resources of science and erudition, and to do justice to the unsurpassed labors and discoveries of the departed Seyffarth in this most interesting yet most difficult field of intellectual labor.

ARTICLE X.

GERMAN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

THEOLOGICAL.—Dorner's *System der Christliche Glaubenslehre.* 2. Aufl. 2. Bd. Specielle Glaubenslehre. 2. Hälfte. pp. 475—1018. Berlin. *Das Neue im Christenthume gegenüber dem altklassischen Heidentume.* E. Höhne. pp. 206. Leipsic. *Der Gottesbegriff in den heidnischen Religionen des Alterthums.* A study in Comparative Religions. Chrn. Pesch, S. J. pp. 144. Freiburg i. B. *Christi Person und Werk nach Christi Selbstzeugniss u. den Zeuchnissen der Apostel.* W. F. Gess. 3. Abth. Das Dogma von Christi Person u. Werk. pp. 488. Basel.

BIBLICAL.—*Wellhausen's Methode,* Kritisch beleuchtet. O. Naumann. pp. 166. Leipsic. *Das Buch der Richter und Ruth.* P. Cassel. 2. Edition. One of the vols. of Lange's Bibelwerk. pp. 314. Bielefeld. *Paulus von Damascus bis Zum Galaterbrief.* G. Volmar. pp. 120. Zurich. *Der Prophet Jesaia,* erläutert. Prof. Dr. C. J. Bredenkamp. 1 Lfg. Cap. 1–12. pp. 84. Erlangen. *Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua.* Prof. Dr. Aug. Dillman. für die 2. Aufl. neu bearb. von A. D. pp. 690. Leipsic. Schmid's *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments.* Hrsg. von Dr. C. Weiszsäcker. 5. Aufl. besorgt durch Dr. A. Heller. pp. 575. Leipsic. *Kolossä und der Brief des hl. Apostels Paulus an die Kolosser.* Ein Beitrag zur Einleitung in den Kolosserbrief. Dr. Frz. Ant. Heule. pp. 93. Munich.

HISTORICAL.—*Johann Valentin Andreä.* Ein Glaubenszeuge aus der Zeit des 30jährigen Krieges. Mit Auszügen aus seinen Schriften. Paul Wurm. pp. 240. Calw. *Karl Immanuel Nitzsch.* Dr. Karl Hermens. pp. 51. Barmen. *Kirchengeschichte* Deutschlands. Prof. Dr. Alb. Hauck. I. Thl. Bis zum Tode des Bonifatius. pp. 557. Leipsic. *Tagebuch über Dr. Martin Luther.* 1537. Dr. Conr. Cordatus. Zum ersten Male hrsg. von Gymn.-Oberlehrer Dr. H. Wrampelmeyer. pp. 521. Halle. *Zwingli als Prediger.* Prof. Dr. Rudolf Stähelin. pp. 32. Basel. *Geschichte des Pietismus.* Albr. Ritschl. 3. Bd. Der Pietismus in der lutherischen Kirche des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts. 2 Abth. pp. 469. Bonn. *L. Annæus Seneca und seine Beziehungen zum Urchristenthum.* Johs. Kreyler. pp. 198. Berlin. *Johann Valentin Andreae,* ein schwäbisher Gottesgelehrter des 17 Jahrhunderts. Geschichtliche Erzählung. Alb. Landenberger. pp. 98. Barmen. *Die Waldenser und ihre einzelnen* Gruppen bis zum Anfang des 14. Jahrhunderts. Prof. Dr. Karl Müller. pp. 172. Gotha.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*Katholicismus und Protestantismus gegen über der*

socialen Frage. G. Uhlhorn. pp. 60. Göttingen. *Ueber die Unfehlbare Wissenschaft.* Eine Schutzschrift für conservatives theolog. Forschen u. Lehren. O. Zöckler. pp. 56. Nördlingen. *Geschichte der christlichen Ethik.* W. Gass. 2. Bd. 2 Abth. 18. u. 19. Jahrh. Die philosoph. und die theolog. Ethik. pp. 386. Berlin. *Ein Tag in Capernaum.* Frz. Delitzsch. 3. neubearb. Aufl. pp. 152. Leipsic. *Evangelische Homiletik.* Ch. Palmer. In. 6. Aufl. bearb. v. O. Kirn. pp. 569. Stuttgart. *Ethik.* Eine Untersuchung der Thatsachen und Gesetze des sittlichen Lebens. Wilh. Wundt. pp. 577. Stuttgart.

ARTICLE XI.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

D. APPLETON & CO., NEW YORK.

Creation or Evolution? A Philosophical Inquiry. By George Ticknor Curtis. pp. 564. 1887.

The unique feature of this book is the fact that while it grapples the issue around which has raged the conflict between theology and science, the author is professionally neither a theologian nor a scientist. His eminence as a jurist, however, and the standard character of his political writings are a guarantee that everything from his pen will be marked by thoroughness, clearness and logical force.

He was led, it appears, to the study of the modern doctrine of animal evolution, "in part from his habit of seeking occasional relief from the monotony of professional vocations in intellectual pursuits of another character, and in part by the remarkable honors paid to the memory of Mr. Charles Darwin and the extent of Mr. Spencer's reputation as a thinker, and the currency which his peculiar philosophy has had in this country." The present volume is the result of the author's careful study of these writers. And its object is to point out "where the conflict arises between some of the deductions of modern science and the principles which ought to regulate not only religious belief, but belief in anything that is not open to the direct observation of our senses." Our space admits of only a few extracts from the author's Preface, which fairly represent his position and give a very just idea of the *animus* and trend of his able argument.

"A careful examination of the new philosophy has convinced me that those who are the special teachers of religious truth have need of great caution in the admission or concessions which they make, when they undertake to reconcile some of the conclusions of modern scientists with belief in a Creator."

"The whole doctrine of the development of distinct species out of other species makes demands upon our credulity which are irreconcilable with the principles of belief by which we regulate, or ought to regulate, our acceptance of any new matter of belief."

"The result of my study of the hypothesis of evolution is, that it is an ingenious but delusive mode of accounting for the existence of either the body or the mind of man; and that it employs a kind of reasoning which no person of sound judgment would apply to anything that might affect his welfare, his happiness, his estate, or his conduct in the practical affairs of life." The volume is designed not only for scientists and philosophers, but for all classes of readers who desire to know what the theory of evolution is and what its bearing on the fundamental beliefs of religion.

G. W. FREDERICK, PHILADELPHIA.

Life and Times of Henry Melchior Mühlenberg, By W. J. Mann, D. D., Pastor Emeritus of St. Michael and Zion Congregation, and Professor in the Theological Seminary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church at Philadelphia. pp. 547. 1887.

A solid and superb octavo reflecting the highest credit alike on the learned author and the enterprising publisher,—and what is still better it is a work worthy of the eminent patriarch whose "Life and Times" it faithfully portrays. The author justly says: "Henry Melchior Mühlenberg needs no biographer to keep him in most revered and loving remembrance in the Lutheran Church of this country. His name is so closely connected with the very genesis of the Lutheran Church here, with the first attempt at its organization, and with the first and successful missionary labors among many dispersed German Lutherans from Maryland to the shores of the upper Hudson, and, in fact, far beyond these limits, that it cannot fall into oblivion. Indeed, while the large numbers of Lutherans in our country are divided on various questions and segregated into divers representative bodies, the name of Mühlenberg is honored among the membership of the General Synod, in the circles of the General Council, in the United Synod of the South, and indeed in every Lutheran community."

His imperishable monument, it may be reverently said, is the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America. And widespread and powerful as this Church has become, its strength, position and influence to-day would be incomparably greater than it is, had Mühlenberg's spirit, his doctrinal soundness, his pietistic zeal, his administrative wisdom, his liberal attitude and progressive measures, always ruled the Church which he was the first to bring into an organic body on these shores. And it may be safely asserted here that no better service could, humanly speaking, be rendered to the Lutheran interests of this country at this particular juncture, than the wide circulation and careful study of this

biography of its founder. It is well for us, in many things, to go back to Luther and learn ever anew the fundamental principles on which was reared the mighty edifice of an Evangelical Church, but as Americans, it is equally wise and perhaps even more profitable for us to go back to Mühlenberg and acquaint ourselves ever and again with the principles and methods, under the practice of which the Evangelical Lutheran Chuch came into distinctive being this side of the Atlantic. Mühlenberg was the instrument of God as certainly as Luther was. All parts and divisions of the American Lutheran Church acknowledge this, and there can be but little doubt that were all these divisions to accept his teachings and measures and cherish his spirit, the whole Church might again come not only under one banner but into one body. And if a prophecy may be ventured in a book notice, it is herewith predicted that if the divers masses of Lutheranism in this land ever coalesce into a unit, it will be by following in the course of Mühlenberg.

There is probably not another man within our communion who combines so many requisites for bringing out this timely work as Dr. Mann. Himself a German, he has had peculiar facilities for the investigation of Mühlenberg's life prior to 1742; for a number of years resident in Philadelphia, and quite familiar with most of the territory on which Mühlenberg's labors were principally expended, and with the more direct results of his activity; sustaining intimate relations to numerous descendants of his subject; himself largely marked by the catholic spirit and liberality which Mühlenberg maintained; and well known for painstaking thoroughness and Christian candor and fairness, the whole Church would probably have united in assigning this task to the present author who happily has made it a labor of love.

Even Dr. Mann, however, like the rest of us, cannot be expected to be absolutely free from certain shackles which are apt to hamper men of strong convictions. For one holding his position it required considerable hedging to write those chapters in Mühlenberg's career, which set forth his position on "Conventicles" and "Prayermeetings," and his practice of "Pulpit-fellowship." But the truth is not sacrificed. And the outcome of the author's treatment of these points very clearly subverts the position taken by some of his neighbors, that a hearty reception of the "pure doctrine" forbids practical fellowship with those who do not in all its parts avow the same faith. "The unaltered Augsburg Confession and the other Symbolical Books" were undoubtedly Mühlenberg's standard, but "his Pietism also brought him into a certain affinity with all those in whom he noticed the symptoms of a living, personal spirituality,"—men, for instance like Whitfield—notwithstanding his denial of regenerating grace in baptism—and the famous revivalists G. and W. Tennent. "In his intercourse with such men Mühlenberg found some spiritual refreshment and encouragement, and *the doctrines which formed a high and strong barrier between their respective church bodies*

were left in the background." So speaks one of the leading representatives of the General Council and a professor in the Philadelphia Theological Seminary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Our readers may be assured that partisan narrowness does not mar these bright pages, and that to no class of readers can this great work prove more satisfactory and profitable than to those who are identified with the General Synod.

HARPER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

For Sale by the J. B. Lippincott Co., Phila.

Psychology. By John Dewey, Ph. D., Assistant Professor of Philosophy in Michigan University. pp. 427. 1887.

This book brings us the result of an attempt to give definite form to the "new psychology," for class-room purposes. Most of the works on mental science have shaped it in the mould of metaphysics, and laid small stress upon the connection of Psychical phenomena with their physiological conditions. Some of the elements of the problems of the mind's powers and functions were not sufficiently studied or considered. Psychology became entangled in the perplexing discussion of metaphysical principles. The physical and physiological studies of our day have given clearer and fuller insight into the relations between the mind and the bodily organism. Earnest and acute investigation has brought fuller acquaintance with many facts in these relations and their dependencies. The new knowledge has been waiting for recognition in the treatment of the mental phenomena and the completer elaboration of the whole science of psychology. In this book Prof. Dewey has sought to reconstruct psychology in accordance with the new materials gained and the supposed demands of the science. That he brought to the task many high qualifications is every where apparent on these pages, in his evident and broad familiarity with the history of psychological speculation and an equal acquaintance with the latest facts and theories of physical science bearing on the subject. The new departure is meant to be thorough, and so far as the *form* of psychology is concerned the reconstruction is a revolution. This is seen in the order of topics and in the terminology of the presentation.

A careful examination of the work makes it evident that while it is rich in helpful facts and suggestions, and deserves to be welcomed by all inquirers in this great study, it is not a complete success. Prof. Dewey, although writing in the interest of a more careful separation of psychology from metaphysics, has nevertheless been greatly influenced in the presentation and interpretation of his material by his own metaphysical principles. He has well illustrated his remark in the preface, that "philosophic implications are not got rid of when they are kept out of sight." His standpoint seems to be that of a modified idealism. In summing up the process of knowledge he says: "One side of the

process of knowledge makes the universe individual by giving it its conscious unified existence in the self; the other makes the individual self universal by realizing its capacities in concrete forms of knowledge. Psychologically speaking, the world is objectified self; the self is subjectified world."—p. 153. It is indeed no fault of the work that it fails to be independent of metaphysical principles or theory. Its faults are mainly those which naturally connect themselves with the first efforts in reconstruction, and appear in unadjusted terminology and representations. The new order of topics compels much repetition, and the new phraseology and explanations here and there lack clearness, exactness, and consistency. Illustrations of this appear in the very beginning, as for instance, p. 2, where after stating the fundamental characteristic of *Self* to be the fact of consciousness, and hence that it "exists for itself," the "facts" of self, as well as the self itself, are declared conscious and to "exist for themselves," failing to keep consistently distinct the conscious self and its phenomena; or, p. 5, where, after explainining the *individual* element in all knowledge, or the subjective side, and also the universal element, the objective side, "the thing known," being "such for all mind whatever," it is alleged that to obtain knowledge requires the individual to "get *rid* of the features which are peculiar to him;" or, p. 22, where the Will is defined to be "the concrete consciousness including both the individual and universal elements," and, p. 23, declared to be "the relation between the subjective and objective." These are specimens, taken at random, of the unadjusted and shifting representations of the psychical facts. When such loose statements of the varied incidental relations of a power the mind are allowed to do service as definitions of the power itself, no very exact or assured psychology can be reached.

Notwithstanding this failure to bring the reconstruction of psychology into distinct and self-consistent presentation, Prof. Dewey's book has high value and deserves the attention of students and teachers in this department of study. It marks a forward movement, and while it does not itself present the finished system, it will prove a most helpful essay in the line of tentative works which shall rightly give to psychology the benefit of the new materials which modern research has accumulated. M. V.

History of Mediæval Art. By Franz von Reber, Director of the Bavarian Royal and State Galleries of Paintings, Professor in the University and Polytechnic of Munich. Translated by Joseph Thacher Clarke. With 422 Illustrations and a Glossary of Technical Terms. pp. 743. 1887.

This massive volume enriched with illustrations on almost every page and written in a very pleasing style, is a work of rare excellence. Its principal merit is one of arrangement and order, the author's aim being

to present the history of mediæval art in conformity with its natural and logical evolution, instead of fragmentary details or isolated groups. Although presented in a very condensed form there is offered a complete and intelligible survey of architecture, sculpture and painting from the early Christian period down to the seventeenth century. The art of the Persians, of the Indian and Eastern Asiatic races, as well as that of the Mohammedans, is treated at some length but the fullest accounts are those which cover the Romanic and Gothic Epochs.

The author is evidently not only a master in the sphere of art, but a philosophic historian. His readers will, accordingly, learn not only the progress of art from its Græco-Roman stages to the early Christian and Byzantine forms, its bloom in Germany and its passage thence to France and from France into England and Scotland, but also the interdependence of these nations, respectively, their varied development in culture and civilization, and the part which Christianity has necessarily performed in the progress of these arts—although the latter does not receive the measure of attention to which it is entitled, except in the illustrations, every one of which, barring the chapters on Mohammedan and Oriental art, is taken from Christian and ecclesiastical designs. Christianity, it is true, took at first an attitude of hostility to art, and considering the debasement of art at the time, this hostility is very creditable to primitive Christian taste, but where would Prof. von Reber have found any material for a "History of Mediæval Art" had it not been for the architecture of churches and monasteries and the paintings and sculptures which were produced for the ornamentation and completion of these Christian monuments. Christianity, too, has furnished the highest principle of art, since its primary and essential concern is the feelings of the soul in contrast with the external and the sensuous, which formed the predominant feature of worship and art among the Greeks and Romans. Although these historic facts are not made as prominent as they might have been, the student of Church history will find valuable assistance both in the text and illustrations of this volume, especially in the discussion of the Catacombs and the Basilicas. It is a companion volume to the *History of Ancient Art* by the same author published some years ago by the Harpers, who never lose an opportunity of issuing for the American public the best works of European authors.

LEE & SHEPARD, BOSTON.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia.

Moral Philosophy; a Series of Lectures. By Andrew Peabody, D. D., LL. D., Emeritus Professor of Christian Morals in Harvard University. pp. 337.

From the preface to these lectures we learn that the author had three purposes before him in their preparation—to present accurately the fun-

damental principles of moral philosophy, to show the inseparable connection between true ethics and Christianity, and to illustrate the laws of duty in their practical application to the questions and activities of daily life. Given as a course of lectures, the discussion has not been shaped into the form and order of a regular scientific treatise. It does not offer itself as a text-book, but as a less formal and more popular presentation of the principles of ethical science for the general reader. The topics traversed are Human Freedom; The Ground of Right; Utilitarianism and Expediency; Conscience; Virtue and the Virtues; Principles, Rules and Habits: Ethics of the Hebrew Scriptures; Christian Ethics; Moral Beauty; Hedonism; The Ethics of the Stoic School; and The Influence of Christian Ethics on Roman Law.

Dr. Peabody's theoretical standpoint is clear and pointed. He finds the ultimate and sole *ground of right* in "fitness"—human duties being viewed as arising out of the relations in which men stand to God, their fellowmen and the various purposes incorporated into their nature. "The fitting is the rule as well as the standard of right. The questions that we virtually ask as to the right resolve themselves into these: What is this thing fit for? What conduct is befitting under these circumstances? What befits me as standing in my various relations to man and to God? The answer to each of these questions determines what is right, and carries with it a sense of obligation or of duty,—*duty*, that which is *due*, or which one owes, *ought* being but a past tense of *owe*." Under this fundamentally sound view all the selfish and utilitarian theories are rejected. *Conscience* is regarded as an original native power of the mind discriminating, by immediate and intuitive perception, the right or wrong of actions, in view of the relations sustained. It may be educated by use and helped by all the knowledge in which men know their relations in every respect more fully. The whole discussion is full of interest and abounds with fruitful thought. There is no dullness about it. It is only to be regretted that the author has allowed himself the insertion of remarks here and there which fit only a Unitarian view of Christianity, and which must mar the acceptableness of parts of the work to many of his readers. M. V.

English Synonyms Discriminated. By Richard Whately D. D., Archbishop of Dublin. New Edition. pp. 179. 1887.

Mistakes in Writing English and how to avoid them. By Marshall T. Bigelow, author of "Punctuation and other Typographical Matters." pp. 110. 1886.

Hints on Writing and Speech-making. By Thomas Wentworth Higginson. pp. 70. 1887.

There can be no question that there is much advantage, as Dr. Whately well said, "in the cultivation of correctness and precision in our expressions," and a publishing house that makes it a business to

bring out a series of excellent handbooks in aid of this art, renders invaluable service to the cause of literature and public speech. Whately on "English Synonyms" is from the last edition, which received the author's careful revision. It has long held the rank of a standard and it is not surprising that a fresh issue of the little work has been called for.

In the same line and "for the use of all who teach, write or speak the language" is Bigelow's very instructive little volume on the "Mistakes in Writing English" which mar the productions of many accomplished and popular writers of English. It is but a small volume but it has condensed a vast amount of very important grammatical instruction.

The chapter of Higginson's "Hints" on writing appeared originally in "the Atlantic Monthly." That on speech-making in "Harper's Magazine." The quality of his "Hints" may be readily inferred from his own practice, as he is a well-known master of the most charming style. Many a writer and speaker who is conscious of his own defects in his lofty calling, will find these "Hints" to be like nuggets of gold which with little effort may be reduced to sterling coin.

The Nation in a Nutshell: A rapid outline of American History. By George Makepeace Towle, Author of "Young Peoples History of England" etc., etc. pp. 147. 1887.

One is astonished on picking up this diminutive volume, at the audacity of its title, but upon examination you are even more surprised to find how well the effort has succeeded. Beginning with our pre-historic antiquity and closing with the downfall of the Southern Confederacy, it sketches the era of discovery, colonization and colonial government, traces the struggle for Independence, the formation of the government and the constitution, Washington's Presidency, the wars of 1812 and that with Mexico, with chapters thrown in on the Presidents, the growth in literature, the arts, science and invention. It is just such a work as is often wanted in every intelligent family, when time does not admit of reading a fuller history.

S. C. GRIGGS & CO., CHICAGO.

Poetry and Philosophy of Gœthe. By Marion V. Dudley. pp. 298.

This volume is composed of lectures and extempore discussions before the Milwaukee Literary School, in August, 1886. Its aim is, as set forth in the preface, "to popularize the thought of a great author through the interpretations of specialists in German Literature." There is a criticism of the Wilhelm Meister, the Divine Comedy and Faust, an examination of Gœthe's relation to English Literature, and a number of discussions of other interesting features of his life, thought, and wrings. The book is one of great merit and will materially aid in acquainting the people of this country with the character and work of this great German writer and philosopher.

In reading these discussions, however, it is to be remembered that

they are the work of warm admirers of Gœthe, who have, in some instances, we think, indulged in excessive laudation. They are, therefore, to be read with some caution. In his address of welcome, President Johnson has made a classification of names with which we cannot agree —Homer, Dante and Shakespeare. He speaks of them as a great triumviri of genius with whom, of all men, Gœthe is worthy to be classed. By their sweep of intellect and the similarity of their epic conceptions, there are three names that are indissolubly united, Homer, Virgil and Milton, the last, though coming latest in time, worthy, by force of transcendent genius, to stand first. Any list of what is meant to be the world's mightiest geniuses in the realm of poetic thought, that entirely omits the names of Virgil and Milton, substituting in their stead those of Dante and Gœthe, must be untrue and misleading. M. V.

Theophilus Trent. Old Times in the Oak Openings. By Benj. F. Taylor. pp. 250.

This is a story of scenes and characters in the early settlements of the North-West. The hero, Theophilus Trent, an A. B. from an Eastern university, "had come West to become president of a college, or a polytechnic institute. The college was not founded, the institute not located, and so he was now Principal of an up-stairs school, *nee* High, at Bodkins." The author has succeeded in making a delightful story in tracing the history of Trent and the far-away village in the Oak Openings. He possesses a genial, earnest, sympathetic spirit united with an irrepressible love for the humorous. In the art of word-painting he is unsurpassed. Even in that humor which is without much pungency, and examples of such are not wanting, there is not the faintest approach to the disgusting realism that has become notorious, not more by its insult to decency than by the labored attempts to defend it. The whole tone of Mr. Taylor's book is wholesome, and we heartily commend it. M. V.

THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN PUBLISHING CO., PHILADELPHIA.

Atonement and Law. Or Redemption in Harmony with Law as revealed in Nature. By John M. Armour. Third Edition. pp. 240. 1886.

That this work has reached a third edition indicates the favor with which it has been received. A careful reading of it explains and justifies the strong impression it has made. It is not only an able and interesting discussion of one of the greatest of the Christian doctrines, but constructs its theory and defense of that doctrine upon a truth or principle of vital importance for its just explanation and vindication. This truth is that the atonement is not "the great exception," as in violation of law, but that it has been provided in harmony with the law of

substitutionary and equivalent satisfaction provided for and perpetually illustrated in the natural constitution of things. In working out his argument Mr. Armour divides the discussion into two parts, the first treating of law, moral and natural, and the second viewing the atonement in the light of such law. The whole discussion, which presents the "satisfaction" view of the atonement, is rich in points and suggestions for the student of this great subject. But able and valuable as is the discussion we are compelled to say that it would have been better and stronger by recognizing the ground of right in the whole nature of God rather than in the sovereignty of His Will, and by avoiding the shaping of his argument on the Calvinistic conception of predestination, absolute reinstatement and confirmation. These features of the presentation we must hold are not only not required by the Scriptures, but are embarrassing and weakening to the best exhibition of the argument which our author otherwise so ably handles. M. V.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

The Way of Salvation in the Lutheran Church. By Rev. G. H. Gerberding, A. M. Written for the common people. With an introduction by Rev. M. Rhodes, D. D. pp. 225.

The author has taken an important theme and he discusses it well, clearly, forcibly, and on the whole correctly. He conforms to the statement of the title page and very sensibly writes for the common people. The select few who may hold themselves above the common mass will, however, find this volume well adapted to remove their prejudices, to correct their errors and to illuminate the path of life for their souls. There is need for just such a work, a wide-spread need, and it will be a blessed service to the cause of salvation if this inexpensive little volume shall have a large circulation. Our only criticism bears against its title, "The Way of Salvation in the Lutheran Church!" The way of salvation was neither invented by the Lutheran Church nor was it devised by God to be trodden only in the Lutheran Church. There is but one way of salvation for all, though alas, by-ways, near-cuts and all manner of improvements have appeared. The market for a work of this character would be much larger if the term Lutheran were entirely omitted. We forget sometimes how urgently we are called upon to spread the truth among all denominations. Or must we evermore be teaching our own people what are the doctrines of their glorious church and for their sakes label these things "Lutheran," instead of inculcating among all churches and upon all readers the saving truth of the Gospel and labeling the same with the Master's own mark? We have no doubt that our Church has the truth, but many of those not of us are much more ready to receive it if we do not call it specifically Lutheran. To do so amounts often to placing the candle under a bushel.

D. C. HEATH & CO., BOSTON.

An Introduction to the Study of Robert Browning's Poetry. By Hiram Corson, LL. D., Professor of Rhetoric and English Literature in the Cornell University. pp. 338. 1886.

It is a happy coincidence that this Introduction to Browning's Poetry should appear just as an elegant edition of his poetical works is issuing from the press of Houghton, Mifflin & Company. Browning's poetry contains some of the most solid and most precious treasures of literature, but such are the peculiarities of his style, embodying, as it does, the profoundest thought, the subtlest and most complex sentiment, and the most quickening spirituality, that to most readers they will remain hidden and sealed treasures unless there be at hand some such key as the present work to aid in grasping them. Prof. Corson has evidently made a thorough mastery of his subject, and after studying his exposition of the character, the art, and the peculiarities of the "subtlest asserter of the Soul in Song," and conning over the arguments given of the several poems included in the volume, the cultured reader whose taste has not been vitiated and whose capacities have not been enfeebled by the enervating tendencies in current literature, will find in Browning the most Christian, the most profound, and by much the most spiritual poet of the age.

THOMAS WHITTAKER, NEW YORK.

A Manual of Christian Evidences. By the Rev. C. A. Row, M. A. Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral; Author of "Christian Evidences, viewed in Relation to Modern Thought," etc. pp. 206. 1887.

Prebendary Row recently gave the public several of the most acceptable volumes on the general subject which he has summed up in the small manual before us. This work is designed to put within the reach of intelligent readers a short general view of the proofs of the divine origin and authority of Christianity. In the structure of the work, he has changed the usual order of presentation of the evidences. Instead of following the method of Paley and most writers, who begin with the historical and miraculous facts in connection with the origin of Christianity, he first arrays the moral evidences and then presents the historical proofs and the authenticating evidence of miracles. He vindicates the propriety of this order by the stress which Christ himself laid on the self-evidencing power of his person, truth and work. Unquestionably, the argument gains some force from this order of presentation. It also loses some. At any rate, Mr. Row presses beyond the facts his assertion of the subordination of the miraculous evidence to the moral, when, in face of the case of the paralytic, Matt. 9 : 6, the word to John's disciples, Matt. 11 : 4, 5, etc., he alleges that Christ "never once attempted to prove the truth of a single utterance of his by working a miracle."

The moral evidence is traced with great force and freshness. The miraculous attestation, though made clear and positive, would become more impressive by a fuller exhibition of the facts. Taken as a whole, we know of no volume which condenses its brief view the Christian evidences more happily adapted than this for popular service amid the skeptical suggestions of the times. M. V.

An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. By the Rev. Benjamin B. Warfield, D. D. pp. 225. 1887.

Under the title of "The Theological Educator," the Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, M. A., editor of *The Expositor*, is bringing out a series of Handbooks which promise to give a solid and trustworthy grounding in all branches of theological study. The present volume is the second of the series and it was a happy selection to assign it to Prof. Warfield, whose contributions to the press on this vital subject have made his name an authority on Textual Criticism, which is second to none in this country. It is in fact, a cause of general regret that his recent transfer to the Chair of Dogmatics at Princeton must, at least measurably, restrict his labors on this important branch of biblical learning, which does not as yet suffer from any works of supererogation. Much that has been written on it in some quarters has been to the prejudice of the faith, but our author represents no destructive criticism.

He modestly claims for his discussion simply the category of "a primer, and a primer to the art of textual criticism, rather than to the science," but his treatise, though in a very small compass, is most learned and masterful and is sure to commend itself generally to biblical scholars. A popular style is employed and such clearness of thought and language as will render it available and full of information to all students of the New Testament, including such as are not proficient in Greek. The successive chapters, after a very instructive introduction, treat of the Matter, the Methods, the Praxis, and the History, of Criticism. The three great modern texts—the eighth of Tischendorf, the one great edition of Tregelles, and the recent edition of Wescott & Hort are recognized as indicating the high-water mark of modern criticism and as agreeing in their settlement of the greater part of the text.

Hints and Outlines for Children's Services. By Rev. C. A. Goodhart, M. A., Vicar of St. Barnabas, Sheffield, England. pp. 178.

Few men are apt at preaching to the young, and yet such preaching is confessedly very serviceable. As exceedingly helpful to one who knows how to use them, these "hints and outlines" seem well adapted. Prepared by a clergyman of the Church of England, the first are arranged according to the church year, while there are enough for other special occasions and of a "miscellaneous" character to satisfy any one. We caution against a slavish following of what is contained in this book, and urge that it be used merely in the way of suggestion.

FUNK & WAGNALLS, NEW YORK,

Encyclopedia of Living Divines and Christian Workers of all Denominations in Europe and America, Being a Supplement to Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. Edited by Philip Schaff, D. D., LL. D., and Rev. Samuel Macauley Jackson, M. A. pp. 271.

The great Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia gives all that can reasonably be desired of deceased authors and other celebrities in the Christian Church, but readers and scholars have often quite as much occasion to know particulars about living authors and distinguished actors who figure in the Church of to-day. This *desideratum* is very happily met by the volume before us. Dr. Schaff seems possessed of an instinctive knowledge of the wants of studious ministers, and with a paternal heart labors from year to year to supply these wants. It is a happy circumstance that those who are the beneficiaries of his versatile and voluminous authorship are appreciating more and more the import and the value of his services. His co-laborer, Mr. Jackson, is animated by the same generous spirit and in his painstaking efforts to secure accuracy and to observe fidelity to truth proves himself a worthy associate.

It is enough to say of the present volume that it is a fitting supplement to the three great volumes of the *Religious Encyclopedia*. By giving biographical sketches of living men of distinction it makes that grand work complete. It also includes notices of divines who have died since the publication of the *Religious Encyclopedia*, and a few others who were inadvertently omitted.

Perfection in a work of this character, however desirable, can be expected only on the assumption of biographical omniscience. We have been disappointed in looking for the names of certain German authors, and it is painful to us to notice the omission of some eminent men in the Lutheran Church of this country, men quite as distinguished and worthy as many who appear in these pages. This, however, does not blind us to the intrinsic value of the work, which all theological scholars will find to be a most serviceable and indispensable book of reference.

Before an Audience; or The Use of the Will in Public Speaking. Talks to the Students of the University of St. Andrews and the University of Aberdeen. By Nathan Sheppard. pp. 155.

The anomaly of thousands of professional speakers in this country who have never bestowed any attention upon the art of public speech, will disappear rapidly if the suggestions of this book shall receive the attention they merit. The author evidently knows what he is talking about, and if his strong sense and genuine helpfulness be practically accepted by those accustomed to address an audience, they will know what they are about when they face a public assembly, and they will be able by a firm exercise of the will, and of other attributes possessed by every man of ordinary culture, to make the most of their subject and of

themselves. The work is soundly philosophical and eminently practical, and can be unreservedly commended to all who gain their bread by public speaking.

The New Psychic Studies in their Relation to Christian Thought. By Franklin Johnson, D. D. pp. 91.

"The New Psychic Studies" mentioned here are the investigations of the "British Society for Psychical Research," established in 1882, and increasing in membership to 586 in April 1885. Among the subjects considered are, Clairvoyance, Monitions, Apparitions of the Living, Mesmerism, Haunted Houses, etc. All are associated with alleged transference of thought, the common terms used being mind-reading and telepathy. The conclusions, as given on page 89, are, "1. We may place mind-reading among the assumed facts of science, though in its clearer forms it is seldom met with. 2. The existence of mesmerism cannot be disputed, and henceforth only its nature, its limitations, and its practical uses will be debated by students. 3. It must be admitted that persons, who are in danger or are about to die, sometimes transmit to their friends and relatives, though separated from them by great distances, their apparitions and their voices." Among the subjects still left in a state of uncertainty are placed clairvoyance, in the broader sense of the word, and haunted houses.

The relation of all these to Christian thought is found in the application to prophecy, prayer, inspiration, demoniacal possession, etc. The author thinks that the battle-ground between Christianity and its enemies is about to be transferred from materialism to psychic manifestations, and urges its defenders to prepare for the strife. An intensely interesting book, whatever may be thought of the researches of the Psychical society or of the views of the author.

CHARLES H. KERR & CO., CHICAGO.

The Morals of Christ. A comparison with Contemporaneous Systems. By Austin Bierbower, Author of "Principles of a System of Philosophy," etc. pp. 200.

Mr. Bierbower wields a vigorous pen and always writes in a strong, crisp and sprightly style. He applies the scientific method to this great subject and shows, I. Christ's Departure from the Mosaic Morality; II. from the Pharisaic Morality; III. from the Græco-Roman Morality. The discussion is throughout most interesting and suggestive, raising farther inquiries from the intelligent reader and often provoking him to sharp criticism. Mr. B. is not by profession a theologian and does not guard his statements with the care that is usually required to save religious truths from misapprehension, yet one would think that his legal practice would accustom him to guarded expressions wherever ignorance or interest may prompt men to draw false inferences. There are many, in the very latitude where this book is published, who will inter-

pret the author as teaching that Jesus held wealth to be a sin, established the principles of communism, and put a premium on ignorance. The discrimination between the spirit and letter which is the key of the great Master's morality, would have served the writer a good purpose. Nevertheless, his work abounds in striking excellencies and merits the study of the best class of readers.

PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION, PHILADELPHIA.

Popular Lectures on Theological Themes. By the Rev. Archibald Alexander Hodge, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology in Princeton Theological Seminary. pp. 472.

The general scope of this excellent work has been given by Dr. Richard, in his article, in this issue, on "Dr. Hodge on the Person of Christ." Little else need be added save to say that the lectures cover nearly the whole scheme of theological instruction of a polemic and didactic character. This will be seen in the subjects as we here give them: I. "God —His Nature and Relation to the Universe." II. "The Scripture Doctrine of Divine Providence." III. "Miracles." IV. "The Holy Scriptures—The Canon and Inspiration." V. "Prayer and the Prayer-Cure." VI. The Trinity of Persons in the Godhead." VII. "Predestination." VIII. "The Original State of Man." IX. "God's Covenants with Man—The Church." X. "The Person of Christ." XI. "The Offices of Christ." XII. "The Kingly Office of Christ." XIII. "The Kingdom of Christ." XIV. "The Law of the Kingdom." XV. "Sanctification and Good Works—Higher Life." XVI. "The Sacraments—Baptism." XVII. "The Lord's Supper." XVIII. "The State of Man after Death, and the Resurrection." XIX. "Final Rewards and Punishments."

These are called "popular lectures," and so they are, compared with those usually given in the theological class-room, but their scholarly character is also conspicuous and they are 'popular' only to the most intelligent lay reader or hearer. We commend them as a compendium of Presbyterian theology from a man of profound learning, but looking, in some important doctrines, more towards Lutheranism than Calvinism. For evidence of this see Dr. Richard's article. This seems to be the tendency among the more learned theologians of to-day.

AMERICAN SUNDAY-SCHOOL UNION, PHILADELPHIA.

People's Commentary on the Gospel according to Matthew. Containing the Common Version, 1611, and the Revised Version, 1881 (American Readings and Renderings), with Critical, Exegetical and Applicative Notes, and Illustrations drawn from Life and Thought in the East. By Edwin W. Rice, D. D. Original Engravings by Dalziel. pp. 316.

This volume has been issued in the interest of "Sunday-school literature of the highest order of merit." The expenses were met by the income from the John C. Green Fund, and we feel assured that the money has been well invested. The copious title-page shows the general char-

acter of the work, and the purpose as expressed in the following paragraph has been quite successfully carried out:

"In the preparation of this volume the chief purpose has been—1. To assist every one to read the Gospel according to Matthew as if he were in Galilee or Judea, and familiar with the scenery, the people, and the habits of life, speech and thought current in Palestine when Jesus was upon the earth. 2. To aid the reader to grasp the meaning of the sacred text, through the Common, the Revised, or, when helpful, through a more literal English version. 3. To present to busy minds the results of critical learning, clearly, concisely, and free from technical terms and from skeptical teachings or delusive speculations."

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO., BOSTON.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia.

Rural Hours. By Susan Fenimore Cooper. New and Revised Edition. pp. 334.

This volume is a "simple record of those events which make up the course of the seasons in rural life. In wandering about the fields, during a long, unbroken residence in the country, one naturally gleans many trifling observations on rustic matters which are afterwards remembered with pleasure by the fireside, and gladly shared with one's friends." The volume is written in journal form. Its chief charm is in the manner of the narrative, which is so simple, unaffected and natural that the reader often feels as though he were looking over letters of an old friend, instead of the diary of a stranger. We have no doubt that Miss Cooper will realize the hope expressed in the preface and that many who, like the honored Hooker, love the country, 'where we may see God's blessings spring out of the earth,' will find much of interest in this volume. M. V.

His Star in the East. A Story in the Early Aryan Religion. By Leighton Parks, Rector of Emmanuel Church, Boston. pp. 292.

The substance of this book was first presented in a course of lectures before the Lowell Institute in the Winter of 1885, on "Christianity and the Early Aryan Religions." It is here published with careful revisions and considerable additions. Its aim, as stated by the author, is, by an examination of the early Aryan religions, "to call attention to the witness that they bear to man's need of the Gospel, and to show that that need has been answered, just in so far as any people, or rather any individual, was prepared to receive it." "The title of the book expresses the thought with which the study began and which subsequent research has deepened, that the 'Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world' has been seen in the East, and that the true way to make disciples of all nations is by declaring unto them Jesus as Agni, Brahma, Buddha, or Sosius, as He was first declared to the Jew as *the Christ.*" The first chapter presents the author's conception of the "religion of

the Son of Man," followed by chapters on Vedaism, Brahmanism, Huduism, Zoroastrianism, concluding with two others on what is termed "the perversion of the gospel" and "the future of Christ's religion." A most interesting field is thus traversed. But, despite the many bright thoughts found here and there, we cannot accept the view here given as the true relation between Christianity and the old Aryan religions—for the reason that Christianity itself is reduced, by the author's extreme rationalism and liberalism, to a mere shadow of itself. All its unique features of atonement and redemption as understood by Christendom for eighteen centuries are surrendered. Mr. Park's standpoint is that in which the worst features of the "new theology" have gone to seed—a mystical immanence of the Logos or divine Reason in all humanity, sin as a wilful "incompleteness" resulting from the lower life out of which man has been evolved, redemption as an evolution out of the beast life to the Christ life. He is a thorough evolutionist, and his gospel is the gospel of evolutionism colored with some Christian sentiment. "Out of the old beast-like life science and the Bible both tell us man is being called, up to a life which science cannot name, but which the Bible calls the new man, Jesus Christ."

Mr. Parks' book can have no value as a study in comparative religion, and can serve only to exemplify the confusion and absurdity into which much of the free thinking of the day is drifting. M. V.

The Complete Poetical and Dramatic Works of Robert Browning. New Riverside Edition. From the latest edition, revised and rearranged by Mr. Browning. With Portrait and Indexes. In six volumes crown 8vo. gilt top.

Robert Browning holds by common consent the first place among the English poets. His thought is sometimes obscure and the aim of his language not especially transparent, but his flight takes the higest range of genius and his writings abound in spiritual ideas. With a rapidly growing number of admirers and students his poetry is destined to exert a profound and lasting influence on our literature.

The publishers are entitled to warm praise for bringing out this new edition which in the text follows with scrupulous care the author's latest revision and which in binding and printing is rarely excelled. Four volumes have appeared within a short time. The first contains Pauline, Paracelsus, Strafford, Sordello, Pippa Passes, King Victor and King Charles V.; the second, Dramatic Lyrics, The Return of the Druses, A Blot on the 'Scutcheon, Colombe's Birthday, Dramatic Romances, A Soul's Tragedy, Luria; the third embraces The Ring and the Book; and the fourth Christmas Eve and Easter-day, Men and Women, In a Balcony, besides a number of other pieces. The two other volumes will shortly follow, the fifth to include Red-Cotton Night-Cap Country,

The Inn Album, Pacchiaratto, with other poems; and the sixth containing The Agamemnon of Aeschylus, La Saisiaz and The Two Poets of Croisic, Dramatic Idyls, Jocoseria, Ferishta's Fancies, Parleyings with Certain People of Importance in their Day.

Mr. Browning, before the publication of *The Ring and The Book*, had gathered all of his previous poems and dramas, and issued them rearranged and revised in a series of six volumes. The present edition follows that series, and continues with the other writings in the order of their first appearance. Dates or the author's memoranda sufficiently indicate the original publication.

The sixth volume will have Indexes of the contents and of the first lines of the poems in all the volumes. The first volume has a fine steel portrait from a recent photograph.

When completed this work will certainly offer a very superior and stimulating body of literature to the reader and form a very attractive addition to the library.

New York. The Planting and Growth of the Empire State. By Ellis H. Roberts. 2 Vols. pp. 758.

These two volumes belong to the American Commonwealth series. In undertaking the publication of such a series, this enterprising Boston firm is laying the whole country under obligation. It is very important that we should have reliable and authentic histories of the different States composing the Union; and sufficient guarantee that we are now about to have such is found is the fact that this series is prepared under the general editorial supervision of Horace E. Scudder.

The volumes before us form a complete, unbroken history of New York State. Beginning with its discovery by the French in 1524, there is a full narrative of the occupation by the Dutch, the attempts of Queen Christina and her great minister, Oxenstiern, to plant and perpetuate Swedish colonies, the rule of the English, ending in the tyranny that drove New York, with other colonies, to declare their independence, and that gave them existence as individual commonwealths. As a State in the Union, its wonderful internal development and improvement are traced, the history being brought down to so late a date as the year 1880.

We heartily commend these volumes. To the careful student of American history they will be invaluable. They are written in an easy, graceful style, with which their neat dress is in admirable agreement.

M. V.

Connecticut. A Study of a Commonwealth-Democracy. By Alexander Johnston, Professor of Jurisprudence and Political Economy in Princeton College. pp. 409. 1887.

This is another volume of the Commonwealth Series noticed above and another proof of the admirable and successful project of bringing

out a historical series which traces the salient features of such States of the Union as have exerted a positive influence in the shaping of the national government, or have a striking political, social or economical history.

Connecticut is in various respects one of our most notable States. As here presented by Prof. Johnston it forms a most interesting study. That Colonial era, with its sturdy virtues, its ceaseless contests, its confusion of church and state, its struggles for liberty while often hostile to its essential spirit, its genetic relation to the formation of our unrivaled government and nation, offers the historian a field as picturesque as the most charming realms of romance. This series of Commonwealths will, it is to be hoped, find its way into all our homes of intelligence. It will do our people good to look betimes at the foundations of our greatness—and to learn from the mistakes as well as from the wisdom of the fathers. The share which the Church had alike in the errors and in the wisdom makes a curious and instructive chapter. It will open the eyes of some, who have looked upon all the Colonial settlers as refugees from religious tyranny, to read that an oppressive Church establishment was one of the most marked features of Connecticut—and that in a measure the connection of Church and State continued till 1818. All persons were from the beginning taxed for Church as well as for State; the taxes for the support of the minister were levied and collected like other taxes, and the civil power collected these taxes by distraint. Civil and ecclesiastical were convertible terms. The township and the Church were co-terminous. The same body of voters settled civil and ecclesiastical affairs indifferently in the same town meeting. The churches recognized in 1650 being considered as established, the commonwealth forbade any persons to form a new church within the colony without consent of the general court and the neighboring churches, while those who were not members of the establishment were compelled to vote taxes and to pay taxes for the support of ministers in whose call they had had no voice.

BIGLOW & MAIN, NEW YORK AND CHICAGO.

Christian Chorals, for the Chapel and Fireside. Edited by Melanchthon Woolsey Stryker. pp. 224. 1885.

One of the most excellent and delightful collections of sacred song that has yet appeared. The hymns are imbued with the devotional flavor and marked by a poetical taste which made its selections chiefly from such standard authors as Cowper, Bonar, Charles Wesley, Montgomery, Faber, Keble and Whittier. But the tunes more especially commend themselves to ears that have often been disgusted with the flippant and irreverent jingle so much in vogue. The editor aimed more at quality than novelty. Some of the airs are in truth so old that to many they will appear new. Nearly all have the ring of grand old mel-

lodies, combining sober churchliness with genuine musical merit, and many have the additional feature of a sacred historic interest. Music of this character will not be as easily acquired as the superficial and senseless strains with which the Sunday-schools are familiar, but when once thoroughly learned, there will be little hankering for an early change of books.

SCHAEFER & KORADI, PHILADELPHIA.

Neue Folge der Sammlung von Beispielen über biblische Hauptbegriffe, &c., in alphabetischer Reihenfolge. Ein Handbuch für Geistliche, Lehrer, Sonntagschulleher und die Familie von A. Rodemeyer. 1. Lieferung. pp. 72.

A work of this character is very much needed by all who study scripture with a view of instructing others. The method followed is admirable. Under every important subject there are given first, scripture passages, then scripture illustrations, followed with parable, example, aphorism, proverb, &c. Excellent judgment and tact are shown in the selections made, and no biblical student can fail to be profited by the aid they offer to the understanding of divine truth. That they appear in German is likewise a guarantee that they are not stale samples of their kind in English, and that they will accordingly be more effective in their use. The present number extends to *Betrug*. We hope the successive numbers will appear rapidly and we bespeak for them a great demand among those who can read German.

PAMPHLETS.

The English Language. Heterogeneous in Formation, Homogeneous, in Character, Universal in Destination for the spread of Christian Civilization. A lecture delivered before *Vanderbilt University*, Jan. 3, 1887. Enlarged and published by request of the Faculty. By Philip Schaff, D. D., LL. D. Cumberland Presbyterian Publishing House, Nashville, Tenn.

The College Question. A Series of Twelve Articles written for *The Lutheran Visitor* and *Our Church Paper*. March–July, 1886. By Julius D. Dreher, President of Roanake College. Office of The Lutheran Visitor, Newberry, S. C.

THE

QUARTERLY REVIEW

OF

THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

OCTOBER, 1887.

ARTICLE I.

THE TRINITY.*

By S. A. ORT, D. D., President of Wittenberg College and Professor of Theology, Springfield, O.

The present lecture is the beginning of the second series on the Holman foundation. In accordance with the example set by my distinguished predecessor, Rev. J. A. Brown, D. D., to whom was assigned the special honor of delivering the first lecture in the Holman course on the Augsburg Confession, I have chosen, now that the first series has been completed, the same subject with which he introduced this Lectureship to the Lutheran public, namely the first article of the Confession, that which treats of the Godhead.

It was surely a wise and liberal act of Dr. Holman to provide, as he has done, for the careful treatment annually of a fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith. No kind of discussion can be more profitable than that which searches for the wide and deep meaning of the truth in Christianity. He who, consequently, makes possible by the endowment of a lectureship the examination of the formulated teaching of the sacred Scrip-

*First Lecture of the Second Series of the Holman course on the AUGSBURG CONFESSION, delivered in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., June 27, 1887.

ture, may indeed be styled a benefactor to his generation, and a true lover of the Church of Jesus Christ. A valuable feature of this endowment is its perpetuity. An exposition and a defence of the cardinal doctrines of our holy religion are thereby secured not only for the ministry and laity of the present period in our Church, but also for those of succeeding times. In this fact appears real utility of the lectureship. While the truth contained in the divine word is unchangeable and identical for all times, still its apprehension by the human mind may be clearer and deeper in one age than another. Besides, each generation must determine for itself what is the sense in which it shall accept the doctrines of the Gospel. No man can apprehend truth for his fellowman; the Church in one period cannot believe for the Church in a period following. Each must receive the teachings of the Scriptures on its own account and formulate its understanding of their real meaning.

It is true one can help the other, and lead it even to a fuller apprehension of the pure word, and in this way the expositions and apologies of Christian doctrine in the past become towers of strength in the future, nevertheless, each generation of Christendom must examine and apprehend the Confession of the Church for itself in order that it may be able to say intelligently, This is my creed. Moreover, the Christian Church in her progress through the world is troubled and assailed by heresy and doubt. These opponents of the true doctrine are in nature always the same, but in form variable. At one time they wear the phase of philosophic speculation; at another they vaunt the pretensions of science falsely so called. Now it is Deism, then Pantheism, now Ebionitism, then Doketism, now Naturalism, then Rationalism. Successful resistance demands the apology of the Church to be always according to the mode of the onset. It is, hence, needful that every age make its own defence, and that this be done in the way necessitated by the kind of weapon which the enemy employs. Repeated and continuous discussion of the prime doctrines of the divine Word is, therefore, essential, in order that the Church may have in each period of her history a clear consciousness of what she believes, and be able to witness to every creature on earth, This is the truth.

The establishment of a theological lectureship, in consequence, may be truly affirmed a helpful method for a defence of the Christian faith, and the maintenance of sound doctrine. In the spirit of such design I undertake in this presence a treatment of what is involved in the first article of our Confession. The text is as follows: "The churches with common consent among us do teach that the decree of the Nicene Synod concerning the unity of the divine essence and of the three persons is true and without doubt to be believed: to wit, that there is one divine essence, which is called and is God, eternal, without body, indivisible, of infinite power, wisdom, goodness, the Creator and Preserver of all things, visible and invisible: and that yet there be three persons of the same essence and power, who also are co-eternal, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The contents of this article are, first, the being of God; second, the mode of his being.

I. THE BEING OF GOD.

A few subjects have absorbed human thought. Chief among these is the divine existence. Away back in the ages men tried to solve the problem of what is beyond the region of the seen. They sought God, if haply they might find him; but their best effort could not clear away uncertainty. The deepest thinking gave only an abstract conception of being, which was thoroughly unintelligible. In modern times the endeavors to determine the question of the supernatural have been no less earnest and intense. Philosophy and science alike busy themselves in working out a final solution. They use the deepest mental processes and make the most careful experiment, but neither the logic of the one, nor the crucible of the other, has revealed what the human mind is most anxious to know. The latest teaching is that the Theistic question cannot be solved, it is an indeterminate problem. The Being of God is unknowable. This is not a recent discovery or a new invention. It is simply the revival of Physhonism, or what at another time was known as Humism. In consciousness is given the perception of phenomena: but since nothing is known by the intellect which was not previously in the sense, it is the phenomenal alone that is

matter of knowledge. But the phenomenal is the temporary, the changeable. All that is known, hence, is the fleeting. There is no certain knowledge of entire mental or material being, because sensations only are perceived in consciousness. Real existence of both matter and mind must, therefore, be a subject of doubt, likewise that of a divine being. This type of philosophical thought neither affirms nor denies. It simply doubts.

Another form of philosophy disposes of the theistic problem in this wise: All knowledge is positive. Positive knowledge is gained by thinking. Whatever is thinkable is knowable. The unthinkable, hence, is the unknowable. But the materials for thinking are perceptions in the sense, the result must be a knowing of phenomena in their limitations and relations. Man knows the relations of things; the things themselves are unknown. The former only have significance, reality, the latter are meaningless and fit merely for empty speculation. Abstraction and generalization give higher forms of being. The ultimate reach is empty consciousness. This persists in the absence of every phenomenon. What then underlies its continuance? Evidently a persistent absolute force. Here is something, "deeper than demonstration, deeper than definite cognition; deep as the very nature of mind, the persistence of Force." All that is known of this absolute Force is that it Persists. Sheer existence of an eternal reality is emphatically affirmed. Beyond this it is impossible to say aught. Spencerian agnosticism believes an impersonal energy always to be, but this absolute is outside the realm of the distinguishable and the relative, and, if ever known, must be known as persistence in consciousness. But persistence in consciousness can give only the limited. The knowable, therefore, is the finite.

In like manner the Kantian philosophy declares, "All our knowledge of existence belongs entirely to the sphere of experience; and although an existence out of this sphere cannot be absolutely affirmed to be impossible, it is a hypothesis, the truth of which we have no means of ascertaining." This conclusion is reached by a critical examination of our knowing powers. What can we know? is the inquiry raised. A careful analysis

gives the following reply: Knowledge embraces phenomena and their relations. Phenomena are the perceptions of sensations, given either externally or internally. Their relations are the modes according to which they appear in consciousness. These relations are conditional for experience, and constitute the laws for knowing. For instance, space and time are necessary for the reception of surface and a train of events. The principle of cause is essential for the real connection of antecedent and consequent. These are *a priori* truths. They make experience possible, and determine how it must be. Speculative reason cognizes the principles and furnishes them to the understanding for the purpose of conducting the operation of connection. But space and time are purely subjective, and since sensations are only ways in which objects affect our senses, what is perceived in consciousness is not the thing itself, but merely impressions under these subjective forms.

The object itself is never known by sense intuition, as perceived in consciousness it is phenomenon. The thing in itself is thought and never given through sensation. Against Locke "the German poilosopher sought to prove that we have ideas independent of experience, and, against Hume, that these ideas have a necessary and universal character." These ideas are forms of perceptions and judgment and not modes of real existence. They are purely subjective. For the reason that they exist in the mind, they cannot exist out of it. They are simply necessary conditions for mental action. They determine the possibility of knowing by the human mind, and, if this possibility is ever realized, so must the perceiving and thinking be.

An external world is assumed to exist, on the ground that it is logically necessary, but any knowledge of its reality is impossible. Speculative reason is merely a regulative faculty, directing the understanding to a certain aim. It works in the region of the transcendental, that is beyond experience, the world of ideas, which regulates our thinking, but contains no real objects. Speculative reason knows nothing of the real, its sphere is entirely the ideal. Beyond the transcendental is the transcendent. This is the realm of the Absolute. Into this region it is impossible for the speculative reason to go. True, it

has a conception of a Supreme being, as a mental necessity, but aside from a divine ideal, altogether faultless, it has no cognition. But since pure reason is the faculty for logical certainty, it is manifest that the domonstration of the real existence of both the universe and God cannot be made. This philosophy cognizes the necessity for the idea of the supernatural, but knows nothing of him as the ens realissimum.

The meaning is, that without this conception the mind would be turned adrift, and consistent, systematic thinking would not be possible. The idea of a Supreme being is a mere hypothesis rendered necessary by the existence of the world, and for the purpose of referring "all phenomena to an all embracing being as the supreme and all sufficient cause." In the several theories mentioned, nothing concerning a divine existence is determined. By some the whole question relating to a supernatural [being] is indifferently dismissed as a subject of no concern to the human mind and advantage in human life. It is treated as a superstitious notion which has arisen out of a fetish state, and with the progress of culture will be gradually eliminated from the history of man. Finally it will be a thing of the ruder past and men in their possession of high intellectual attainments, will no longer exercise their mental powers in trying to know whether an eternal something existed before star dust and protoplasm, or who it is that dwells beyond the sky. By others the problem of a divine existence is treated more seriously. In fact the positive affirmation is, that an Absolute exists. To this, the mind in its logical regressus from present fact to ultimate cause, is rigidly forced. Additional to this, it is impossible to offer a single statement. Being is, but to it can be ascribed no perfection. Attribute and essence are completely separated. The supernatural, hence, is everlastingly unknowable. Practically, then, he does not exist. The Absolute is a mere conception of abstract thought for whose real existence there can be no verification. In like manner the critical philosophy denies the reality of a divine being to be a question which the logical understanding can ever answer. It is an enigma, a puzzle whose secret speculative reason, the faculty for science and philosophy, is incompetent to find out.

The problem must, therefore, be handed over to the practical reason, the faculty which cognizes freedom. This is the region of reality. Here the transcendent is known. Freedom gives the conviction of moral obligation, what I ought to be. In setting before me what I ought to be, there is at the same time afforded the assurance of what I may hope. But since what I ought to be carries with it the possibility of what I may become, the realization of this demands that my existence be continued without end. Hence I know myself to be immortal. Further what I may become, for the practical reason, can be no empty form, but is already realized. Otherwise the highest good would be a delusion. But the highest good for me is only possible, when it is realized in a being higher than myself. The actualization of the highest good, therefore, postulates the existence of God. This is the famous moral argument for the being of the Supernatural.

Aside from the deduction of the practical reason, the result thus far reached is negative. Two positive views concerning the being of God have on the other hand been advanced and defended by the majority of thinkers. The first is the pantheistic conception of God.

Pantheism has two forms, idealistic and materialistic. The former teaches that mind is the Absolute and the universe its phenomenon; the latter that force is the only reality, and is deity. The first is called Acosmism; the second Pancosmism. In short God is everything, or everything is God. Strictly speaking these two forms at last merge into one, absolute substance or pure being. Modern philosophy began with a distinct recognition of two realities, mind and matter. Each was affirmed to be a substance. The definition, however, given of substance, namely, that which is self-existent, marked out the road that the new attempt of human thought must take and determined its destination. Spinoza quickly saw the necessary consequences. Real existence of two eternal realities is absurd. One only can be. This is the Absolute. It is not matter, for what reason should it be more than mind. It is not mind, why should it be more than matter. In truth then it is neither. Since there can be no more than one substance and this is the Absolute, neither

matter nor mind has substantial being. What then are they? Eternal attributes.

But as attributes they express nothing of substance. They are not its manifestation in any form. Substance is neither understanding nor extension. Matter and mind, hence, are mere external attachments. They are ways the understanding has of perceiving the essence of substance. In reality they are nothing, and can mean nothing.

In the absolute of Spinoza everything finite is lost. It is the fathomless abyss which swallows up the entire universe of seeming actual existence. If now we turn to ask what is this absolute no answer is returned other than it is that which self-exists. Further reply is impossible, because omnis determinatio est negatio, every determination is a negation, that is every attempted definition denies to being that which it really is.

The God of Spinoza has neither reason nor will; he is existence, or, to adopt the eleatic statement, is pure being. He appears in consciousness, now as thought, then as extension, but these are only modes of his manifestation and show nothing of what he is in himself. He is neither mind nor matter in any sense, but the infinite, infinite nothing.

The great problem in philosophy has been and still is to adjust the relation between the two factors in knowledge, subject and object. Spinoza annihilates the reality of both, the result is nameless existence, a measureless ocean whose surface presents now the scene of waters rolling in waves of varied height, then surging in wild madness, heaving and tossing in restless fury far and wide, again calm, smooth, with not the smallest ripple, a boundless waste. "All particular existences, all that seems individual being, are only bubbles that fret, or vapors that rise from this ever heaving and shoreless sea; and they will soon break, or be collected in drops, and find their way back to identity with that which is at once their birth-place and their tomb." This is deity, destitute of consciousness, intelligence and will, the ocean of pure being.

In the Kantian philosophy, the reality of the subject was emphasized, and that of the object assumed. Fichte on the contrary rejected the valid existence of the noumenon, the thing in

itself, and maintained that in the proposition, "I think" certainly refers only to the subject.

Knowledge is composed of two elements, the thinker and the act of the thinker. Both are together in consciousness. They express, hence, the relative. In short the ego acting is knowledge. But the ego in consciousness cannot be the ego out of consciousness, although it necessarily presupposes it, because the one is known while the other is not known. In the present case the search is not for an ultimate philosophy, but a final science. An exhaustive science, however, demands for its basis a self-evident, necessary truth. This is at once found in the prosposition A = A. From this is readily drawn the opposite, A is not: not A. The equation A = A affirms nothing concerning existence. It declares merely the principle of equality. In matter it is purely hypothetical. If now there be any reality this can be substituted for the symbol. This evidently is at hand and must be the knower of the formula just stated. We may, hence, legitimately substitute ego for A and say ego = ego. But the opposite of ego is non-ego. The antithesis consequently is, ego is not: not ego. Nevertheless in consciousness ego and non ego do not stand apart from or over against each other. They are together in unity. This unity is knowledge. Non-ego is the action of the ego. If the latter were not, the former could not be. But the effect carries with it necessarily into consciousness the cause. Since, therefore, knowledge embraces only ego and non-ego, and since the second is produced by the first, it follows for one thing that subject and object reciprocally limit one another, and again that the only real existence is not the ego in consciousness, but the ego out of consciousness. This only is the universal, the absolute, the unconditioned.

I am not authorized, however, to say "it is my ego or your ego or any ego in particular; for as yet there is no distinction between me and you, but whoever points the ego is that ego and is alone in the universe. This is absolute idealism or rather egoism and pantheism both in one." According to this view God is infinite activity.

Again, as the philosopher I sit down and fix attention solely on the ego and non-ego in consciousness. I abstract one mark of difference and then another, until finally I see them without distinction. Subject and object both have vanished from my intellectual vision, and I gaze on what is neither one nor the other, but the identity of the two. The ego has disappeared and likewise the non-ego. There remains only pure identity, and this is the absolute. The process may be represented on this wise. Take matter, abstract one quality and then another, until the process has been exhausted. The result is pure being. Treat mind in the same manner. The outcome is as before. But pure being must be identical with pure being; that is the point at which matter and mind become the same is the absolute. According to this view God is infinite Potence. One philosopher assumes the real existence of the subjective and calls this God, another sees both subject and object at their indifference point and names this Deity; a third follows objecting to each position taken, and rejects them as alike unphilosophical. There is left still another course that may be taken. The fundamental reality in egoism and absolute identity is neither the ego on the one hand nor the identity on the other, but the process involved in both. This is thought. We can dismiss the content in either case, and attend simply to the process. "The outward thing is nothing, the inward perception is nothing, for neither could exist alone; the only reality is the relation of the two, which shows that the essence or nature of being itself consists in the co-existence of two opposites."

This co-existence can be found only in consciousness. It is not possible that it should be elsewhere. Subject and object are known entirely in relation. Destroy the connection between them and both instantly cease to be. It is, therefore, the basis of their existence, and constitutes what is called the thing itself. Co-existence of subject and object is idea, and is the only reality known. Thought is relation, and is identical with being. The highest mental abstraction is universal being. But that which is void of all quality is indeterminate. Between it and nothing there is no distinction. Pure being or thought is therefore equal to naught. No more is known of the one in itself than the

other. Pure being in itself is nothing, and not being in itself the same. But these, being and not being in relation are something, they are existence. The absolute, hence, is not pure being, but the union of being and non being. He is the everlasting becoming, the eternal process of thinking. He generates being and non being by thinking them in co-existence; he is then co-existence. He is, therefore, the ONE, because he is relation; he is the ALL, because the all is only relations. To find this absolute it is merely necessary to begin with any notion in consciousness, and trace the way backward by the dialectic method. The final abstraction is the one. For every fact in consciousness there is the absolute. If the idea seized be that of personal existence then the discovery will be personality, not, God who is a person, but personality itself, which can only have reality in the consciousness which thinks it.

Consequently apart from the universal consciousness of man, there is no divine consciousness or personality. According to this view God exists as thought ever realizing itself, but never realized. He is the eternal movement of the universal. It can be readily observed that this final philosophy of the absolute ends in the boldest pantheism. Kant boldly maintained the position that a science of God is impossible. His successors in the field of philosophic thought, however, determined to show that the sage of Kœnigsberg was mistaken. They began with experience in consciousness, and resolved the dualism of subject and object, one by suppressing the real existence of the object, and deifying the subject; a second by recognizing the reality of both, but as eternal processions from their identity, a third by affirming their actual existence as relation, and in this by a process of resistless logic finding the source of all things. The conclusion was as thoroughly in consciousness as the beginning. The circle was completed; the terminal the same as the starting point. The final result like the first, pantheism. This was precisely what the author of the "Critique" insisted must ever be the outcome of regulative thought, a God in idea. No wonder that after these journeyings of the human mind over the wide continent of knowledge, descending into the deep valleys, climbing the hills and scaling the mountain heights of

thought, there should now be an anxious return to the country whence departure was taken, to examine more closely its scope and bearing, if perchance a better route to the longed-for destination cannot be traced. What road other than some of the ways already taken is apparent? It may be said, with sound reason, that a different course from Kantian ground is impossible. Logical thought is circumscribed by the limits of space and time. Beyond these it never can go. Reason may furnish the idea of an absolute, a supernatural, to the dialectic faculty, and in the processes of this faculty this idea may be used necessarily, but it must at the same time be observed, that the logical method determines nothing concerning reality. Logic decides the correctness of the form of judgments, but is indifferent about their matter. It uses the idea of a supernatural in its operations of connection, without raising the slightest inquiry concerning actual existence. Its province is not to find out what is real but to furnish a science of the laws of thought. The question, hence, is, Can reason vouch for the reality, corresponding to its ideas? It possesses the conception of an absolute, does it know this absolute to be real? Does it have the idea of a God because he exists, or is it an idea whose necessity is demanded by the process of logic? At this point pure theism begins. Necessary idea involves necessary existence. The possession of the first is conviction that the second exists.

The existence is in the idea. The old saying is that something has always been. The contradictory is inconceivable, hence impossible. The Absolute, the Infinite necessarily exists. Here pantheist and theist agree. So far the conception is the pure abstract. It is simple Absoluteness, bold Infinity. But when the inquiry is raised, What is this always something, this necessary abstraction, pantheist and theist part company. Both are bound by necessity, need an Absolute. Both begin their reply by positing a self-evident proposition, gotten in the same way by each, namely, intuition. The one sees an infinite activity, an absolute Potence, an eternal process; the other an absolute Reason, who is intelligence and will. If now the question be asked, Why the latter rather than the former? the answer is, because reason is so constituted that it would be unreason if it

did not have this idea. In its making this was wrought into its very being in such way that the two are altogether inseparable. Human reason is the image of the absolute reason. When, therefore, it knows itself, it thereby necessarily cognizes the existence of the divine being. In other words, in apprehending what it is in itself, it finds the necessary idea of a God. But this necessary idea is the fundamental principle of finite reason, hence, according to the essential law that every effect must have a cause, logic demonstrates the necessary existence of the eternal God, that is dialectics reveals, makes certain, what the human mind holds in its very being.

The existence of finite reason is ground for the conviction of certainty, concerning the actual being of the absolute reason. It can readily be perceived that the swing is now made from the *a priori* method for the determination of the divine existence, to the *a posteriori* form for logical proof. The true starting point is a known reality. This may be either the universe external to man, or man himself. By induction of natural facts, and observation of their connections a stairway is constructed up from one grade of existence to another until the loftiest height of nature has been reached, and then the human mind standing on this high eminence gathers up the highest power of its being and leaps unerringly into the very bosom of its source, the eternal, personal God. Pure theism conceives the Absolute to be the unconditioned, the self-intelligent, the self-sufficient. He is distinct from and independent of the universe, and the creator of all things. Deism, however, goes no further. God has originated the universe, and ordained its laws. Beyond this he has no connection with the world of finite being. The works of his hand were made in perfectness. They have no need of his care. They were created to stand and move alone and attain their destiny. He has no want they could supply. They have no need which requires his aid. From the nature of the case, providential government is absurd. The almighty God once came forth from the solitude of his eternity and created the worlds, then retired into the solitariness of his being, and, without the smallest concern, left the universe with all its divers forms of life to run its career of fate. He constructed a most

wonderful machine, set it going, and then withdrew to be the idle spectator of its varied movements. This conception of the Supreme Being undeifies him, and makes nature to be an independent reality.

It is in place now to observe that the two systems, pantheism, and natural theism, fail to solve the problem of God and the universe, This is true as respects the actual existence of both and their relation to each other. Pantheism finds an Absolute, but he is the Absolute of space and time. It knows a universe, but it is the Absolute ever unfolding himself. It puts them in necessary relation to one another, but such is the relation that they are inseparable. Natural theism on the contrary claims to apprehend a mono-personal God, who is the self-existent, all-wise and benevolent one, who made heaven and earth. It affirms God and his universe to sustain the relation of creator and creature and makes them to be separable. It recognizes the valid being of the natural and the supernatural, and the necessary dependent connection of the one on the other. Natural theism views God as entirely external to the universe, the transcendent. Pantheism postulates the Absolute as wholly within the universe, the immanent. Natural theism gives an unresolved dualism. Pantheism a destructive monism. Neither one, therefore, solves the problem.

Again each of the two systems fails to satisfy the human mind. Pantheism completely destroys personality and free will and so thoroughly identifies God and man that the individual is lost in the universal. However logical may be the course of thought and seemingly irresistible the conclusion, nevertheless the deep conviction remains, that God is other than unconscious activity and man superior to the universe in which he dwells. The pantheistic explanation of all things never has afforded the impression of a satisfactory solution of the question old as the history of the world. Even those who have devoted themselves to the working out and over again of the non-theistic theory, at last have not been content with the result attained. In the application of the pantheistic view to an interpretation of human life, they finally reach the most cheerless conclusion and find the best state possible to be the worst. Theism has its argu-

ments for a divine existence old-timed and far-famed, the ontological, the cosmological, the teleological. One claims for its conclusion the force of mathematical demonstration. The others furnish an array of natural facts which suggests the irresistible inference of an unconditioned Absolute. Theology usually begins its discussion concerning God with these proofs for a divine existence. Every treatise on the positive side of the theistic question goes over the same arguments. The latest discussion is but a repetition of the same proofs, with a restating of the same facts. And yet with all this statement and restatement, thinkers dispute the validity of the ontological, and the sufficiency of the cosmological and teleological arguments for the divine existence. The custom now is to make apology, or to admit that the natural proofs for the being of God give merely an inkling of what he is. These arguments deal with the forms of things, their order, harmony, and final purpose, and show they must have had a maker, but of their essence they determine nothing. But the human mind not only inquires who made the forms, but also seeks to ascertain how the essence came into being. Besides all this, even should the valid conclusion be a mono-personal deity, still difficulties with such a conception of the divine being readily arise and cannot be put down by any process of reasoning, or intuitive insight. A mono-personal God is not the divine existence who is, and hence the mere theistic idea of the supernatural is not the bare conception of the eternal, personal Absolute. Notwithstanding the failure of these systems to fully satisfy the human mind, the fact remains, that pantheism and theism alike enlist the attention of the thinking powers of man and secure an abiding interest. They are not absurdities. They each contain a great truth. Pantheism with its glaring errors preserves a fundamental principle, the divine immanence. Theism with its mistakes maintains with equal emphasis the transcendence of God. These are principles which commend themselves to the reasonableness of thought, and accord with that deep-seated conviction of the real divine existence which human history discloses at every stage of progress. No system destitute of every element of truth has or ever can interest the human mind. However the intellectual

capacity of man has come to be, and however formed, one fact is beyond dispute, namely, that between it and what is true there is an abiding affinity. Its nature perpetually prompts it to search for the verity of things, and its supreme interest ever centers in knowing and possessing truth. If there be long standing theories of error, and systems of philosophy based on false positions, and if these have worked their way into the general thought of man and become wrought into the history of the world and at different times have showed themselves to be over-mastering influences, all this is fact because these theories and systems have running through their structure a great principle which the human mind somehow feels to be true. The irrepressible conviction of the soul is, first, that the God who has real being not only exists before the finite universe, but in the essence of his being is no part of nature, and, second, that he is in and through the universe, actually the life of its existence. Theism on the one hand consequently will always engage the earnest activity of man's knowing powers, while on the other hand Pantheism will awaken the deepest thought of the human understanding. At the same time, each alone cannot cause man in his intellectual search for highest truth to rest in complete satisfaction; neither can the two combined develop in consciousness the true knowledge of the divine Being.

The careful thinker cannot fail to recognize what it is which determines the caste of every type of theistic and antitheistic thought. This is the vital point in the great problem concerning God, man and the universe. Generically it is the same in all systems of science, philosophy and theology; specifically it varies according to the difference between the several schemes of intellectual endeavor. It is itself in fact the problem whose solution the human mind in thinking tries to work out. I mean unity. An examination of natural science quickly shows that this is the ultimate end of every investigation pushed to its farthest reach on this territory. The subtle analysis of complex facts, the tracing of one energy to another, the reducing of the many to the few, and the persistent effort to find the single element to which all others may be referred, and to which they are essentially bound, this unremitting toil, and earnest prying into

the secrets of nature's laboratory, are the determined search of the human mind to find the unity of nature. The final and grandest attainment of science will be the clear and certain knowledge of this fundamental reality in the natural world. In philosophy no less than science unity is the determining principle. It is the web and woof, the soul and marrow of every system which mind has originated. To get the unity is the first step, to defend or verify the unity gives the treatise. The kind conceived is the kind of philosophy developed. Theology likewise is not destitute of this principle. Equally with science and philosophy the guiding truth through its development of religious doctrine is unity. There is at the foundation that which comprehends all the parts of the structure and binds them together in a complete and systematic whole. What this that comprehends and binds together is, constitutes the type of theologic view. It makes the specific theology. In the question concerning God, the inquiry, What is the true unity? demands a clear and certain answer. On the correct reply depends the final solution of the theistic problem. The unknown quantity is the real connection of entities, rather than the reality of their existence. In truth the problem is, given the valid being of God, man and the universe, to find their unity. This must be, otherwise man and the universe could have no possible existence. Absolutely apart from their source they could not exist. To assume they could, would be to make them self-existent. Two or more self-existing entities is an absurdity. Be then what two of the known quantities in this problem may, in any case some kind of connection with the third they must bear. What this actually is solves the question. The Cartesian philosophy began with two certainties, mind and matter. These are distinct in kind, hence incommunicable. Immediate connection between them is impossible. But if they exist in reality then somehow they must be brought together. In what way? Without doubt not directly. Then how? Only one possible mode remains—the intervention of a third existence. This third existence is readily found in the idea of the most perfect Being, who creates both thought and extension and through his

will binds them together. "God is therefore in a certain degree a deus ex machina, necessary in order to mediate the conflict of the ego with the extended." Such a mediation is, of course, entirely external.

In the Kantian philosophy the subject of supreme interest is systematic unity. The processes of speculation require a regulative principle. This principle is a law of reason running through the entire operation of thinking and making all the varied parts stand out together in consciousness, a consistent whole. "The greatest systematic unity, and consequently, teleological unity, constitutes the very foundation of the possibility of the most extended employment of human reason. The idea of unity is therefore essentially and indissolubly connected with the nature of our reason. This idea is a legislative one." Without it the universe could not be thought as a whole. The ideal of pure reason, hence, determines the unity of speculative philosophy, in other words, the unity of all knowledge, and, therefore, of all reality in consciousness. A divine being is only an idea of pure reason, and solely necessary in order that the highest systematic unity may be. In the critical philosophy, hence, the supreme unity is ideal.

Pantheism abhors dualism. It at once denies that any object exists as the unknowable. The unknowable in philosophy is an abomination. Reality out of consciousness is impossible. There must be absolute unity. Subject and object as real substances defy connection. If they can have true relation, it must be as modes or manifestations of one and the same existence. This existence is the only substantial reality. The *one* alone has being. Pantheism hence prides itself in having the highest possible unity, which is entirely numerical. Theism knows three realities, mind, matter and God. The first two are derived existence, the third is eternal being. The first two are no part of Deity, yet sustain a necessary connection to him. He made them what they are. God is the unconditioned; he is person, and in his own being is absolutely independent of space and time. Man and the universe are the conditioned, they are therefore objective realities. They have risen into existence, not by emanation or evolution, because God is the transcendent, free per-

sonality. They are his act, the creative act of his almighty power. The material world is irrational; the bond which hence binds creator and creature is dynamic. Man is mental and ethical being, the link which ties him to his original is the power of absolute reason. These various postulates of the true unity are plainly misconceptions. The unity in question cannot be mechanical; if so, then the highest reason for the existence of the divine being is found outside himself, which according to his nature is impossible. Again, this unity cannot be ideal, otherwise matter and mind would exist together and yet at the same time actually be non-co-existent. Furthermore the necessary unity is not numerical. The converse of this radically changes the problem. Thereby two of the three quantities are as to their essential, substantial existence destroyed. The remainder is the one. But this is quantitative, not qualitative unity, and is gotten by high-handed assumption. The clear conviction of common consciousness insists that both matter and mind have real substantial being. The unity on which Pantheism sinks or swims, survives or perishes, belies the very consciousness in which it starts, through which it moves and where it lives and thrives.

God is not a mathematical reality, neither is the only unity that of the equation. Lastly, the needed unity is not dynamic. If it is, then God and his universe never come immediately in contact with each other. Theism urges the reality of a dynamic unity, and on this stakes the validity of its conclusion concerning a personal God. But it needs only to awake to the true situation, to find that it either places the creator so completely outside the universe as to become Deism, or, if it emphasize the reality of the divine so intensely as to make God himself immanent in his creation, it loses his transcendence and becomes Pantheism. Besides, since its highest conception is that of an absolute who has intelligence and will, the only companion which can be for this mono-personality is the universe. If wedded to this companion, as he must be by his creative power, the only unity possible between them is dynamic. If this be virtual presence of the Absolute only, the gateway of Deism opens; if it be maintained to be real presence then the finger-board

points toward the broad road of Pantheism. But Deism with its formal connection of God and the world soon bends its course toward Acosmism and ends in Spinozism. Natural Theism based on the conception of a dynamic unity at last is devoured by its foe, Pantheism.

All systems postulate, as a prime necessity, unity. The three quantities as substantial being in the theistic problem must be retained. Their real connection remains to be found. This is unity, and, to satisfy the conditions of the problem, it must be the highest possible unity. What is it? The negative answer has already been framed. It is neither mechanical, nor ideal, nor numerical, nor dynamic. Positively, the reply is that it must be a unity whose reality is a real existence. The possibility of such existence is ground for the possible being of man and the universe. The actuality of the natural demands this existence to be actual. In the thought of God the universe exists as possible because the highest conceivable unity as itself existence, is known as possible.

As reality objective to himself, it can be and is united to him by a dynamic bond, because the union of the natural and supernatural can be and is itself actual existence. This is the only unity which can satisfy science, furnish a true philosophy, and be the basis for a right theology.

Fact is what is needed. This science requires; with this final philosophy must deal, and on this, as the eternal foundation, theology must stand. Is there the fact, a real existence, which is this unity? If not, then the problem is indeterminate. Kant's strictures on Theism, philosophically considered, are sound. Pantheism and Theism alike fail. Since, therefore, neither logical thought, nor rational intuition finds the true unity, we must turn elsewhere, and ask, does religion furnish the needed fact? Heathenism certainly does not, because it always ends either in deifying nature, or absorbing the natural in the supernatural. Judaism and Mohammedanism are in the same condition, because with their basis of a mono-personal God they stand on Deistic ground. There remains yet one other system, Christianity. In this stands out in boldest relief and highest prominence, the long sought and the essential fact, the fact of

facts: the Incarnation of the Logos. Jesus Christ is the unity of God and the universe. In the compass of his being man on one side is material, on the other rational. The forces of his body are the energies of the physical world. The endowments of his rational nature are the powers of the finite spiritual universe. The material universe and the spiritual are joined together in immortal wedlock. Their union is man. God said, "Let us make man in our image and according to our likeness. And the Lord God formed man out of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul." The unity of material nature and finite spiritual being is a real existence. This is man. His creation did not consist in making the elements of his being, for these previously existed, but in uniting these to be a real, living existence, a person. Man, therefore, is the realization of the highest possible unity between the material and the finite spiritual. In consequence he stands in being at the head of the universe. He is God's masterpiece of handiwork. Without him creation would be unfinished, not as to quantity, it is true, but as to quality. It is, however, the quality which is fundamental. Without the quality creation could not be a thought of God and certainly not a reality. Without the idea of man in the consciousness of God, the universe as it exists could not be a possible conception, much less an objective reality. As above said, the realization of the highest possible unity between the material and the finite spiritual is man. This is not dynamic unity, but a real, living union of heterogeneous elements,—a personal existence. It remains yet that man should be united with God. If the union between the material and finite rational is a real, personal existence, the inference certainly is that the union between God and man must likewise be a real personal existence, on the one side divine, on the other human. Christianity says, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God and the Word was God. And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us." This is the highest, truest unity possible, and finds its reality in him whose person is the son of God and the son of man. What man is to finite spirit and matter, Jesus Christ is to God and the universe, their unity. In him God and his crea-

tion are actually, absolutely one. No Christ in idea, no universe in thought, A universe in fact, a Christ in reality.

The Logos incarnate is the only possibility of the existing universe; the existing universe foretells with infallible certainty the ultimate existence of the incarnation. The ideal of pure reason, the highest regulative principle of true thinking, is not a mono-personal absolute, but the Christ of Christianity. The one which philosophic thought demands is not the mathematical unit, but Jesus of the gospel. The Pantheistic absolute is the abstract of Jesus Christ. The incarnate God is the true basis for theistic *a priori* thought. The sum of all teleology is the divine Nazarene, and he in the concreteness of his being must be the initial point of the *a posteriori* mode of theistic thinking. Pantheism affirms the only actuality to be absolute being, because God, man, and the universe must be in absolute Unity, and absolute being is this unity. Christianity gives this real, most perfect unity in an actual living existence, the elements of whose being are very God and very man. Pantheism is founded on the all-embracing truth, the unity of existence, but in the form of an abstraction. Christianity possesses the great truth of God, the truth of man's being and the truth of the universe in the person of the incarnate Logos, who himself declared, "I am the truth," the whole kingdom of truth, "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, and in whom dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." In the being of man is given the reality of the substantial existence of matter; in the same being that of mind, of spirit. In the being of Jesus Christ is exhibited the substantial existence of man on the one hand and the substantial existence of God on the other. The Christian view, therefore, is, first, all-comprehending; second, the impregnable position; third, the irrepressible truth; fourth, the final philosophy; and, lastly, the true and only true theology. It is all-comprehending, because Jesus Christ is the real, living union of God, man and the universe. It is the impregnable position, because by the incarnation it maintains the actual being of the three quantities in the great problem, and the true dependence of two of those quantities on the third. It is the irrepressible truth, because the Word made flesh is the

real truth, and not a reflection of it. It is the final philosophy, because the divine person, Jesus of Nazareth, is not a speculative idea, but a certain fact. It is the only true theology, because the God-man is not on the one hand a mere manifestation of the divine being, but he is divine being, a theophany; on the other hand he is not the mere appearance of human nature, but he is in reality human nature, the second Adam. This view, it can readily be perceived, makes the incarnation not primarily necessary for redemption only, but pre-eminently necessary for the existence of a universe with finite rational beings.

Whatever universe in essence there may be, the same condition for its existence holds, namely, the real unity, as being, of God and that universe. On the other supposition, namely, that incarnation which exhibits and is the highest, most perfect union between God and finite being, is for redemption solely, in the possible case of no sin having arisen in the history of moral creatures, the absolute union between the natural and the supernatural, God and man never could be realized. The union between them would be eternally imperfect, unconsummated.

Primarily the incarnation is the metaphysical, cosmical principle of the universe. The life of the incarnate Logos will, however, be determined in its manifestation by surrounding circumstances and external conditions. If the incarnation exists as fact in a world of sin, the history of the incarnate one will be characterized by humiliation and atonement. If the incarnation exists in a realm of holiness the history of the incarnate God will be characterized by ineffable glory. The fact stands that each is a reality. God was originally manifest in sinful flesh; he is now manifest in a glorified humanity. Wherefore, it appears that incarnation continues to have significance after redemptive work is finished. If the incarnate Logos is the perfecter of the world through redemption, what hinders that he should be the perfecter of the world were the case such that redemption would not be needed? If redemption be the end of incarnation, when the former is completed, what further need of the latter? Why continue? Is the God-man seated at the right hand of the divine majesty to be nothing through the eternal ages, except a spectacle of saving grace? Assuredly the Church teaches no

such doctrine. The received view has always considered the incarnation to be conditioned by circumstances. This is true so far as to the course its life must take. In itself considered, as the supreme unity, it is above all circumstances and independent. It is conditional that circumstances may be. Logically, as idea, it is first; in time it can occur anywhere in the progress of cosmical development. In the scheme of redemption, atonement is first. In the execution of the scheme instead of occurring as objective fact immediately at man's fall, it was postponed on account of circumstances four thousand years. Neither did it take place at the beginning of the incarnate life among men, but at its close. In the mind of the Godhead incarnation eternally existed as real, first, as the fundamental principle of a universe, second, as the only sufficient plan for meeting the direst emergency which might arise in the moral world.

Since the emergency has arisen, and it is man who is involved in it, the plan will attract chief attention, both in the communication which God makes and in the historic life of the incarnate divinity. In this remedial method vicarious suffering and death, the climax of it, will be the fact most prominent.

Sin is separation from God, the disunion between God and man; its purpose is the utter destruction of the human creature; this is absolute death. Since the incarnate Logos is the union of divinity and nature, sin is the attempt to undermine and reduce to nihility the ground principle of creation. In the destruction of the creatureman, it means the reducing of the universe to eternal chaos, the everlasting overthrow of the Logos.

But the overthrow of the Logos is the overthrow of the universe, and the driving back of the divine creative and preserving energy to pure subjective reality. Sin, hence, first explores the universe to find the being who is its unity, that it may take him captive. Success so far is only partial triumph. There is still a higher, all-embracing unity. The search now is for the being who is the union supreme, and when found the great battle begins. This being will sometime appear, become manifest, not as an abstract principle, but as a real, living person, the first-born of every creature. During four thousand years sin searched the generations of man, the cosmical unity, for the incarnate Lo-

gos, until at length it found him in the wilderness of Judea, hard by the banks of the Jordan. Here the mighty struggle begins; through three years it continues, deepens in intensity and desperateness at every progressive stage, until it reaches the summit of Calvary, and there culminates in death grapple. The God-man dies, but his expiring agony completes the wedlock of eternal righteousness and eternal love in saving grace. Sin abounded. Grace now much more abounds. But the last enemy still disputes the kingdom. On the morning of the third day, however, after the struggle on Calvary, the incarnate Logos walks forth from the dominion of death, the resurrection and the life. He that was dead is alive, and behold he is alive forevermore. A little while afterward the divine Nazarene returns whence he came. The eternal gates lift up their heads, the everlasting doors open wide, and as the monarch of the ages he enters the heavenly domain, traveling in the greatness of his strength, and takes his rightful place on the divine throne, the king of glory, the Lord of the Hosts, strong and mighty in battle. There he is forever, not merely the world's redeeming mediator, but also its perfecting mediator.

The grand end of the universe is perfection. This end will be contemplated whether sin does or does not exist. In either case it can be reached alone by the fullest self-revelation of God. But this self-revelation of the divine being is only possible through the Logos, for in him is the fulness of the God-head, and he is the self-revealing principle of divine nature. But this perfection of the whole creation in its life cannot be merely ideal. In that case it would be eternally without objective reality. But highest truth is not in the ideal, but the real. Perfection of the unity of the two worlds of finite being will hence stand out in real objective existence. This existence must be the Logos as he has taken up into himself the nature of man, become an original reality, and made God, man and the universe to be in actual unity.

The being of God in its essence is not physical and logical merely, but pre-eminently ethical. The divine being is free spirit, he is love. It has been well said, "The incarnation of

God as the Logos is not physically necessary to God. God does not need in himself incarnation in order to his self-realization. Whilst in his internal being potence and act are given as eternally alike, the incarnation is a work of the will of love." "From the beginning he has willed the world to himself, in order to communicate himself thereto, to be manifest for it and in it and to dwell in it for its glorification and blessedness." "The God-man is the center of the history of the world. He sends his rays backward and forward to enlighten, because by relation to him everything is organically combined into the unity of a universal plan." Consequently, Christianity furnishes the only true conception of God. This true conception involves the reality of the Logos. In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was God. The incarnate Logos is "the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation: for in him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth; all things have been created through him, and unto him; he is before all things, and in him all things consist." Pantheism teaches divine immanence. Pure Theism says the dynamic presence of its mono-personal God is in and through the universe. But the true and real immanence is neither the immanence of Pantheism nor of pure Theism, but the immanence of the Logos who created all things and who in the being of Jesus Christ is actually immanent in the universe. This is the immanence which Christianity teaches.

The Logos is the creator and sustainer of the worlds. "Of him, and through him and to him are all things." The paraphrase of Bishop Lightfoot on Collossians fitly expresses the view already indicated. "The Logos incarnate is the perfect image, the visible representation of the unseen God: He is the first-born, the absolute heir of the Father, begotten before the ages: the Lord of the universe by virtue of primogeniture, and by virtue also of creative agency. For in him and through him the whole world was created, things in heaven and things on earth, things visible to the outward eye, things cognizable by the inward perception. His supremacy is absolute and universal. He is first and he is last. He is pre-existent and self-existent before all the worlds. And in him as the binding and sustaining power,

universal nature coheres and subsists." This last expression tells the true immanence. It is the immanence of the Logos whose home is in God and also in the world. Through the eternal Logos God is everywhere in and through the universe, its life and preserving power. In him it lives and moves and has being. As through the Logos God made the worlds so through the Logos and only through him God is immanent in the things that are. For a like reason the true and real transcendence of God is secured. Neither Pantheism, nor pure Theism, nor any system of human thought ever has or ever can teach the true doctrine of transcendence and immanence. But error in this doctrine is misconception of the God who actually exists. Christianity alone furnishes the right conception. Through the incarnation, hence, is revealed the true divine existence. This is not mere absolute substance, or mono-personal, infinite existence, but a trinity of persons of one essence, coeternal, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. This is the true conception of God. Every other view is a misconception. God, if thought correctly, must be thought as trinitarian.

ARTICLE II.

THE LUTHERAN ORIGIN OF THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH.

By John G. Morris, D. D., Baltimore, Md.

The Augsburg Confession is the doctrinal *magna charta* of all Protestantdom. Just as all free nations of the earth have drawn their principles of civil government from the English "Great Charter of Liberties," extorted from King John in 1215, so nearly all Protestant organizations have based their Formulas of Faith upon the greater "Bill of Rights," proclaimed in Augsburg, 1530, during the reign of Charles V.

The Augsburg Confession was the first Confession of Faith adopted after the Reformation was begun, and the substance of it and, in many instances its precise language, have been incorporated into every similar Declaration, with the exception of

two perhaps, adopted by other Communions since that day. It is the standard of pure Protestantism, and under this banner our triumphs have been achieved.

"Its influence extends far beyond the Lutheran Church. It struck the key note to other evangelical Confessions and strengthened the cause of the Reformation everywhere. It is, to a certain extent also, the Confession of the Reformed and the so-called union churches in Germany, namely, with the explanation and modifications of the author himself, in the edition of 1540. In this qualified sense, either expressed or understood, the Augsburg Confession was frequently signed by Reformed divines and princes, even by John Calvin, while ministering to the Church at Strasburg, and as delegate to the Conference in Ratisbon, 1541; by Farel and Beza, at the Conference in Worms, 1557; by the Calvinists, at Bremen, 1562; by Frecerick III. (Reformed) Elector of the Palatinate, at the Convention of Princes in Nuremberg, 1561, and again at the Diet of Augsburg, 1566; by John Sigismund of Brandenburg in 1614."—*Schaff, Creeds of Christendom, I. 235.*

It is our purpose, in this paper, to show to what extent the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, and indirectly all other Protestant Confessions are indebted to the Augsburg Confession, as well as to note the influence which the Lutherans of Germany had upon the English divines of those days in forming their theological basis, not only in their Declaration of Faith, but also in the completion of their Liturgy and Homilies.

The testimony shall be principally derived from eminent divines of the English Church, accompanied by that of other writers of established reputation. All these quotations are taken from the original sources in the Peabody and Whittingham libraries of this city, and have been verified, so that no citation is made at second hand.

In the year 1804, Archbishop Laurence, a distinguished dignitary of the Church of England, preached eight sermons before the University of Oxford, on "An attempt to illustrate those articles of the Church of England which the Calvinists improperly considered Calvinistical." These sermons constitute volume VIII. of the Bampton Lectures; the edition from which these

quotations are made, is that of Oxford, 1820. The discourses are illustrated by learned and extensive notes.

The nature of the sermons may be inferred from the themes which are here given. I. The General Principles of the Reformation from its commencement to the period when our Articles were composed, shewn *to be of a Lutheran tendency.* II. The same *tendency* pointed out in the Articles themselves, as deducible from the history of their composition. III. On Original Sin, as maintained by the Scholastics, the Lutherans and our own Reformers. IV. On the tenet of the Schools respecting merit *de congruo*, and that of the Lutherans in opposition to it. V. The Article of "Free Will" and of "Works before Sanctification," explained in connection with the preceding controversy. VI. On the Scholastic doctrine of Justification, the Lutheran and that of our own Church. VII. The outline of the Predestinarian system stated, as taught in the Schools, and as Christianized by Luther and Melanchthon. VIII. The Seventeenth Article considered in conformity with the sentiments of the latter, and elucidated by our baptismal service.

In sermon I., p. 12, the Archbishop says:

"In this country, where the light of literature could not be concealed, nor the love of truth suppressed, Lutheranism found numerous proselytes, who were known by the appellation of 'The men of the new learning.' This was particularly the case after the rupture with the see of Rome."

Henry VIII., at that time King of England, undertook to reform the doctrine of the English Church, and, the more effectually to propagate the new principles in his dominions and to accelerate the arduous task in which he was engaged, he invited the ever memorable Melanchthon to come to his assistance. That he did not solicit the co-operation of Luther on this occasion, should not, perhaps, be solely attributed to his personal dislike of the Reformer; he well knew that the Protestant Princes themselves, at the most critical period, had manifested a greater partiality for Melanchthon, and hence he urged the latter to come and help him, but he refused.

"After the commencement of our Reformation, Melanchthon was repeatedly pressed personally to assist in completing it,

both in Henry's and Edward's reign. In a letter dated March, 1534, he says, 'Ego, jam alteris literis in Angliam vocor.' Ep. p. 717, and again October of the following year: 'Ego rursus in Angliam non solum literis sed legationibus et vocor et exerceor." Ep. p. 732. Ed. Lond. 1642. The cause, however, why he did not come then, as at first he intended, (for the Elector of Saxony had consented to his journey, and Luther was anxious for it,) he explains in another letter to Camerarius: "Anglicæ profectionis cura liberatus sum. Postquam enim tragici casus in Anglia acciderunt, magna conciliorum mutatio secuta est. Posterior regina (viz., Anna Boleyn), magis accusata quam convicta adulterii, ultimo supplicio affecto est." Epist. lib. IV. 187. In 1538, he was again solicited. During the short reign of Edward, solicitations of a similar nature appear to have been frequent." Laurence, pp. 195–99.

In letters to Camerarius in September, 1535, he says, "Ab Anglis bis vocatus sum sed expecto tertias literas," and again in April, 1536, "Et sic me Angli exercent vix ut respirare liceat." This was when he was holding almost daily conference with the English Ambassadors in Wittenberg. Well may Browne in the Introduction to his Exposition of the 39 Articles, say, "Melanchthon seems to have known Henry's character too well to wish to become his counsellor."

Laurence proceeds to say, "Melanchthon * * possessed every requisite to render truth alluring and reformation respectable, and hence upon him in preference the Princes of Germany conferred the honor of compiling the public profession of their Faith. When Henry therefore applied for the assistance of this favorite divine, by seeking the aid of one to whom Lutheranism had been indebted for her Creed, he places beyond suspicion, the nature of that change which he meditated. * * Some popular instructions were either published (before this) or sanctioned by royal authority, which, with the exception of a few points only, *breathed the spirit of Lutheranism.* Of this no one at all conversant with the subject can for a moment doubt, who examines with attention the contents of what were at that time denominated *The Bishop's Book* and *The King's Book*, the two important publications of the day."—p. 195.

Hardwicke in his Articles of Religion says, "As early as the Spring of 1534, Melanchthon was invited to come over and assist in the *reforming of the English Church*,—an invitation which appears to have been warmly supported by the King on many subsequent occasions."

Seckendorf, Lib. iii. §66, add. 1. Frankf. 1692, gives us an extract of Henry's letter:

"In 1538, Henry wrote as follows to the Elector of Saxony, "Pro his, quae feliciter agi coepta sunt, felicius absoluendis concludendisque expectamus ut Dominum Philippun Melanchthon in cujus excellenti eruditione et sane judicio a bonis omnibus multo spes reposita est, doctosque alios et probos viros, primo quoque tempore, ad nos mittat."

Melanchthon was finally appointed professor in Cambridge (May 1553) but owing to the death of Edward never came into residence.

"Melanchthon dedicated his Commentary on the Epistles to Henry VIII., who sent him (upon it) a present of 200 crowns and wrote him a letter full of particular esteem and assurance that he would always assist him in those pious labors, dated from Winchester, 1535."—*Burnet, Hist. English Reformation, III. 211.*

Ledderhose in his life of Melanchthon says, it was his *Loci Communes* which he dedicated to the King. He also wrote him a letter, highly commending him personally and dilating on the necessity of a universal reformation of the Church. This letter may be seen in the Appendix of Strype, No. xcv., Oxford, 1822, and in Laurence's Bampton Lectures, 227.

"We have before seen that Henry VIII. was particularly anxious that Melanchthon should visit England, and the same proposal was made to that reformer from Cranmer in the reign of Edward VI.: but this object was never accomplished. He appears to have been consulted in 1535 concerning the articles which were published during the next year; and the definition of *Justification* there given is probably derived from the *Loci Communes* of this author, *in the whole of these articles the ideas and language of the Lutheran divines have been closely followed. Many of the forty-two articles owe their origin to the same source,*

and even those which cannot be traced with certainty exhibit a correspondence with the general opinions of the German divines." * * *

"If this examination of the question shall surprise those who generally esteem the *authoritative documents of the Church of England original compositions*, if it shall seem to detract from the value which is generally attached to the labors of Archbishop Cranmer and his colleagues, let it be remembered that the sacred subject on which these works were drawn up is the only one in which originality is the worst of faults." * * *

"At the commencement of the Reformation in England, our reformers naturally cast their eyes on two standards of faith—on that of the Church of Rome and that of the Lutheran churches which had already discarded the errors of the papal court. The rule, then, which sound reason would seem to dictate, is, that in those points wherein the Church of England found it necessary to differ from that of Rome, it should refer to the newly established churches, and follow them as far as they were consistent with the Scripture: and where that was taught by the Lutherans appeared to be questionable, the Church of England would either borrow the expression of its opinions from some other Reformed Church, or construct its own articles directly from the word of God. * * In our articles are contained the great truths of Christianity, which we hold in common with the Church of Rome; there are many more which *are derived from the Lutheran Church.*" * * *

"There is every reason for applauding the conduct of Archbishop Cranmer and admiring our own standard, because they so nearly resemble the works of the same sort which have preceded them; and to rejoice *that the documents of our Church are not new*, but amended transcripts of those which our forerunners have established." * * *

"With regard to the Confession of Augsburg, there is not only a general agreement in doctrine but in many places the very words of the one are transferred into the other."—*Short, Hist. of the Church of England, pp. 164, 165.* See Short, p. 168, for a comparison between the articles of the Augsburg Confession and the 39 Articles.

"In 1538, in consequence of conferences between Cranmer and the German divines, a body of 13 articles were drawn up in *great measure agreeing with the Confession of Augsburg.*"—*Browne, Exposition of the 39 Articles, Introd., vi., London, 1850.*

The following extract is from Schaff's Creeds of Christendom:

"Under Edward VI. the influence of the Melanchthonian theology as embodied in the Augsburg Confession (1530) and the Suabian Confession (1552) became more apparent and can be clearly traced in Cranmer's earlier writings, in some of the Articles of Religion and in those parts of the Book of Common Prayer which were borrowed from the "Consultation" of Archbishop Herman of Cologne, compiled by Bucer and Melanchthon (1543). Hence the English Church has been called sometimes by Lutheran divines, *Ecclesia Lutherisans.*"—Vol. I., 600.

* * * * * * *

A short code of doctrines had been drawn up long before the death of Henry, with the title "Articles devised by the King's Highness Majesty to stablish Christian Quietness and Unity and to avoid contentious opinions, which Articles be also approved by the Consent and Determination of the whole Clergy of the Realm (1536).* On this subject the Archbishop says:

"Nor is complete originality even here to be met with: the sentiment and many of the very expressions, thus borrowed, being themselves evidently derived from another source, *The Confession of Augsburg.*

"The offices of our Church (after Edward had ascended the throne) were completely reformed, (which before had been but partially attempted,) *after the temperate System of Luther,* * * nor were any alterations of importance, one point alone excepted, made at their subsequent revision. At the same period also, the first book of Homilies was composed, which, although *equally Lutheran,* * * has remained without the slightest

*For further information, see Collier, Eccles. Hist., II., 122. Burnet, Hist. Ref. I. add. N. Fuller, Ch. Hist., XVI. B. V. 93.

emendation to the present day. * * Cranmer, who had never concealed the bias of his sentiments, now more openly and generally avowed them. He translated a *Lutheran Catechism*, (1547), * * dedicated it to the King and recommended it in the strongest terms. * * The opinions of the Primate (Cranmer) were at that time *perfectly Lutheran*, and although he afterward changed them in one single point, in other respects, they remain unaltered."—p. 17.

"As little reason is there to question his ability, as his personal influence, his personal influence as his attachment to Lutheranism. This latter point seems beyond all controversy."—p. 24.

"On the whole, therefore, the principles upon which our Reformation was conducted, ought not to remain in doubt. With these the mind of him to whom we are chiefly indebted for the salutary measure, was deeply impressed, and *in conformity with them* was our Liturgy drawn up and the first book of our Homilies, all that were at that time composed."

"That *our Articles* were in general, *founded upon the same principles*, I shall in the next place endeavor to prove."

"Our Reformers, indeed, had they been so disposed, might have turned their attention to the novel establishment at Geneva, which Calvin had just succeeded in forming according to his wishes, might have imitated its singular institutions and inculcated its peculiar doctrines, but this they declined, viewing it perhaps as a faint luminary, * * this they might have done, but they rather chose to give reputation to their opinions and stability to their system by adopting * * *Lutheran sentiments* and expressing themselves in *Lutheran language*."—p. 25.

"During the negotiations with the Lutheran divines (1535–38) held partly at Wittenberg, partly at Lambeth, an agreement consisting of 13 articles was drawn up in Latin at London in the Summer of 1538, which did not receive the sanction of the King but was made use of in the following reign as the basis of several of the 42 articles. * * They are based upon the Augsburg Confession, some passages being almost literally copied from the same."—*Schaff, Vol. I., 612.*

"These articles, 42 in number, the first that were constructed

by the Church of England on the principles of the Reformation, were indebted to the clear theological distinctions of Melanchthon and other reformers in Germany and *derived more especially from the Confession of Augsburg.*"

"But some progress had already been made in this work by the English divines during the reign of Henry VIII. * * In compliance with his earnest wishes and with the view of promoting other important objects as well as an agreement with in religious sentiments, a deputation of three eminent reformers had been sent from the Protestant Princes of Germany in the the year 1538, who immediately on their arrival in England, joined with Cranmer and others in drawing up articles of religion on the model generally adopted by their own countrymen." —*Cardwell, Synodalia, Vol. I. p. 1.*

For these 42 articles and in parallel columns with the Elizabethan articles, see Hardwicke, App. III., 277.

"No small part of the fresh matter in the Articles of 1536 was borrowed from a *Lutheran* document, itself in turn an echo of the Augsburg Confession. It bears the title of the Confession of Wurtemberg."

This Confessio Wurtembergica was drawn up by Brentius, in the name of his Prince, Duke Christopher, who had resolved to send delegates to the Council of Trent. The Emperor had invited the Protestant States to send delegates, promising them full protection. Brentius prepared the Confession for that Council, as Melanchthon had drawn up the Confessio Saxonica for the same purpose. Brentius was approved by a commission of ten Suabian divines and by the City of Strasburg. It was also approved at Wittenberg as agreeing with Melanchthon's.—*Schaff's Creeds, &c., I. 341.*

The Archbishop begins his second Sermon in these words:

"On a former occasion I endeavored to prove, that the established doctrines of our Church, from the commencement of the Reformation to the period when our Articles first appeared, were *chiefly Lutheran;* to point out, that the original plan was ultimately adhered to, and that in the composition of our national creed, a general conformity with the same principles was scru-

pulously observed, will be the object of the present lecture."—p. 29.

"At the commencement of Edward's reign, it appears that Melanchthon was consulted upon this interesting subject. He was then alone at the head of the Lutherans, universally respected as the head of their much applauded Confession."—p 36.

There was some delay in the completion of the Thirty-Nine Articles, owing to various causes, and the Archbishop continues: "Among other reasons which may be assigned for this delay, is it not possible that one might have been the hope of obtaining the valuable assistance of Melanchthon, who was repeatedly, in Edward's, as well as in Henry's reign, invited to fix his residence in this country?"—p. 39.

"If it be too much to conjecture that the delay was not imputable to the wish of submitting them to his personal inspection, and improving them by his consummate wisdom, the coincidence nevertheless of the time, during which they were postponed, with that of his much hoped for arrival here, cannot altogether escape observation. * *

"Many of the argumentations upon points of doctrine at the same time introduced, were not only of a *Lutheran tendency*, but *couched in the very expressions of the Lutheran Creed.*"

"Considering them, therefore, even in their rude outline, but more particularly in their perfect state, we discover, that, in various parts of their composition, Cranmer studiously kept in view, that boast of Germany and pride of the Reformation, *the Confession of Augsburg.*"

"If we, then, duly weigh the facts, which have been stated, and the consequences which seem to result from them, we shall not, perhaps, be at a loss to determine, from what quarter we are likely to collect the best materials for illustrating the Articles of our Church. We perceive, that in the first compilation many prominent passages were taken from the Augsburg, and in the second place, from the Wurtemberg, Confession. * * *These were the Creeds of the Lutherans.*"—p. 46.

"It may then, perhaps, appear, as well from internal as external evidence, whence Cranmer derived the principles of our national Creed. * * It may appear, that *from the Lutherans*,

who had been his masters in theology, he had learned * * almost everything, which he deemed great and good in reformation."—p. 52.

With regard to the present Liturgy of the Church of England, the Archbishop says:

"In the year 1543, Melanchthon and Bucer drew up a Reformed Liturgy * * for the use of the Archbishoprick of Cologne. From this work, the occasional services of our own Church, where they vary from the ancient forms, *seem principally to have been derived.* It was not, however, itself original, but in a great degree borrowed from a Liturgy established at Nurenberg. * * *All our offices bear evident marks of having been partly taken from this work.* * * In our Baptismal service, the resemblance between the two productions is particularly striking."—p. 144.

Proctor in his History of the Book of Common Prayer, London, 1870, p. 41, thus speaks:

"Of all the foreigners who were engaged in the work of Reformation, Melanchthon had the greatest influence both in the general reformation of the English Church, and *in the composition* of the English Book of Common Prayer, where it differed from the mediæval Service Books."

"Melanchthon was repeatedly invited into England, and it seems probable that his opinion, supported by his character and learning, had great influence on Cranmer's mind. As early as March, 1534, he had been invited more than once; so that the attention of Henry VIII. and Cranmer had been turned towards him, *before they proceeded to* any doctrinal reformation. The formularies of faith which were put forth in the reign of Henry, are supposed to have originated in his advice. On the death of Bucer, (Feb. 28, 1551) the professorship of Divinity at Cambridge was offered to Melanchthon and after many letters he was at last formally appointed (May, 1553). It is, perhaps, needless to add that he never came to England."* * *

"The first book was largely indebted to Luther, who had

*For a fuller account of the negotiation with Melanchthon to go to England, see Hardwick's Articles of Religion, 1859, p. 53, Strype, Eccles. Mem. I. 225–98.

composed a form of service in 1533, for the use of Brandenburg and Nurenberg. This was taken by Melanchthon and Bucer as their model when they were invited (1543) by Hermann, Prince Archbishop of Cologne, to draw up a Scriptural form of doctrine and worship for his subjects. This book contained 'Directions for the public service and administration of the Sacraments, with forms of prayer and a litany.' * * The *Litany presents many striking affinities with the amended English Litany* of 1544. The exhortations in the Communion Service and portions of the Baptismal Services, *are mainly due to this book*, through which the influence of Luther may be traced in our Prayer Book." * *

"They (the Thirteen Articles of 1538) not only indicate the disposition of our leading Reformers to acquiesce in the dogmatic statements which had been put forward in the Augsburg Confession, but have also a prospective bearing of still more importance, as in many ways, the ground work of articles now in use. No one can deny that the compilers of the Forty-Two Articles in the reign of Edward VI. drew largely from the Lutheran formulary of 1530."—*Ibid. 61.**

"In the first year of the new reign (1548), he (Cranmer) had 'set forth' an English Catechism of a distinctly *Lutheran* stamp, indeed originally composed in German and translated into Latin, by Justus Jonas, the Elder, one of Luther's bosom friends."—*Ibid. 68.*

"With reference more particularly to the Sacrament of Baptism, the baptismal office of our own Reformers was derived in no small measure from Luther's *Taufbüchlein*, itself the offspring and reflexion of far older manuals."—*Ibid. 95.*

Hardwick, in Articles of Religion, Cambridge 1859, p. 13, says:

"That Confession (the Augsburg) is most intimately connected

---

*For a parallel between the Augsburg Confession and the XIII. Articles here spoken of, see Hardwick, p. 62, seq., and for a parallel between the Augs. Confession and the Forty-Two Articles of 1553, see Appendix III., Hardwick, and for a parallel between the Augs. Conf. and the Thirty-Nine Articles, as finally agreed upon in 1571, see Annotated Prayer Book.

with the progress of the English Reformation; and besides the influence which it cannot fail to have exerted by its rapid circulation in our country, *it contributed* directly, *in a large degree, to the construction of the public formularies of Faith* put forward by the Church of England. The XIII. Articles, drawn up, as we shall see, in 1538, were based *almost entirely on the language of the great Germanic Confession*, while a similar expression of respect is no less manifest in the Articles of Edward VI., and consequently in that series which is binding now upon the conscience of the English Clergy."

"A perception of this common basis in religious matters, aided by strong reasons of diplomacy, suggested the commencement of negotiations with the "princes of the Augsburg Confession," as early as the year 1535. The first English envoy sent among them was Robert Barnes, the victim, only five years later, of his predilection for the new opinions, &c."—*Ibid. 53.*

"But while (King) Henry was thus faltering on the subject of communion with the German League, a conference had been opened on the spot between the English delegates and a committee of Lutheran theologians. Luther himself was a party to it from the first and Melanchthon came soon afterwards (Jan. 15, 1536). The place of meeting was at Wittenberg in the house of Pontanus (Brück), the Senior Chancellor of Saxony, where Fox dilated on the *Lutheran tendencies of England*, and more especially of his royal master."*—*Ibid. 55.*

"Afterwards Henry begged 'the Princes of the Augsburg Confession' to send to England a legation of divines (including his peculiar favorite Melanchthon) to confer on the disputed points with a committee of English theologians. * * The whole course of the discussion was apparently determined by the plan and order of the Augsburg Confession."—*Ibid 56, 57.*

The result of the Conference with the Germans was a 'boke' (book) which is manifestly founded on the Confession of Augs-

*See Seckendorf, Comment. De Lutheranismo, Lib. II. §xxxix for an account of certain articles of religion which were drawn up by the mediating party in 1535 and '36. Of those, one article has reference to the Lord's Supper, and is merely an expanded version of the Augsburg Confession.

burg, often following it very closely. * * *The article on the Lord's Supper is word for word the same.*"—*Ibid. 60.*

"About the same time Cranmer (1548) put forth his Catechism. This work was translated from a German Catechism used in Nurenberg, through the medium of a Latin version made by Justus Jonas.—*Ibid. 142.*

"In 1535, Fox, Heath and Barnes were sent Ambassadors to Smalcalde, where proposals were made to them by the Protestant Princes, that the King should approve the Confession of Augsburg."—*Ibid. 110.*

"Whatever use he (Cranmer, 1536) might have made of the Helvetic Confession in forming his own opinions, he does not appear to have introduced it into the work in which he was engaged (preparing the Forty-Two Articles), but with regard to the Augsburg Confession (1530, printed 1531 and re-published with alteration 1540), there is not only a general agreement in doctrine, but in many places *the very words of the one are transferred into the other.*"—*Ibid. 268.*

"It appears that he (Archb. Parker of Canterbury, 1559) had himself been recasting the Forty-Two Articles of King Edward * * and that he added to the Articles, which had been mainly drawn from the earlier Lutheran Creeds, some new clauses obtained from the more recent confession of Wurtemberg."—*Cardwell, Synodalia, Oxford 1842, 2 vols., vol. I., p. 35.*

Bishop Bull, in his "Apology for the Harmony and its Author," bound with his "Examen Censurae," p. 292, Oxford, 1845, says in reply to Dr. Tully:

"Dr. Tully now hastens to the Augsburg Confession. Where, in the first place, he finds fault with me because I called *that the greatest of all the Reformed Confessions, not excepting even our own Anglican one.* * * I only said the same thing that many learned men both of our own and foreign countries have said before me, and who also highly honored our Church. Now the Augsburg Confession is deservedly *called the greatest* for more than one reason. In the first place, (not to say anything of its most excellent and learned principal author, Phil. Melanchthon,) *it was the first of all Confessions.* Next, when it was published, it was approved of by the consent of almost all, if not of all the

Reformed Churches, Universities and Doctors. Lastly, it is still received and held in certain kingdoms and great principalities and free States. The Doctor, moreover, is offended, because I said that the heads of our Church had followed and imitated this Confession. *But what can be clearer than this?* The first article of our Confession is taken almost *word for word* from the first of the Augsburg. Our second is *clearly copied* from the third of Augsburg. Also the sixteenth in ours * * openly imitates, towards the end, the anathemas of the eleventh in the Augsburg, as our twenty-fifth does the thirteenth in the Augsburg. Again, in our homilies how often must the attentive reader who is acquainted with Melanchthon's writings, *hear him speaking!* Add to which * * that Hooper of blessed memory * * was in the habit of copying long passages from Melanchthon's writings, *almost word for word.*"

Bishop Bull, in his *Harmonia Apostolica*, Oxford, 1842, pp. 197 seq., says, "This is the same as is meant in the Confession of Augsburg, which as it is the most noble and ancient of all the Reformed Churches, so both here and in other places, the heads of our Church *have followed it*, that whoever is ignorant of it can scarcely conceive the true meaning of our articles."

"The (39) Articles are Catholic in the œcumenical doctrines of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation, like all Protestant Confessions of the Reformation Period and they state those doctrines partly in the very words of the *two Lutheran documents*, viz., *The Augsburg Confession* and the Wurtemberg Confession."

"They are Augustinian in the Anthropological and Soteriological doctrines of Free Will, Sin and Grace, herein likewise agreeing with the Continental Reformers, especially the Lutheran."—*Schaff, Vol. I., 622.*

For a comparison of the Augsburg Confession (1530) the Thirteen Articles of 1538 and the Thirty-Nine of 1563, and also a comparison of the Elizabethan Revision of the 39 articles with the Confessio Wurtemburgica, see Schaff, Vol. I., 624.

"It has been shewn by Archbishop Laurence and others, that the Lutheran Confessions of Faith, especially the Confession of Augsburg, were the chief sources to which Cranmer was in-

debted for the articles of 1552. He did not servilely follow but yet made copious use of them."—*Browne, Exposition, p. x.*

"As Cranmer had derived much from the Confession of Augsburg, so he took several clauses from the Confession of Wurtemberg.—*Ibid.* See Laurence, Vol. 8, 233.

"It appears that one of (Archbishop) Parker's (1559) earliest labors was directed towards a recasting of the Articles of Religion. In this work he was guided like Cranmer in a great degree, by Lutheran Formularies."—*Ibid., London, 1858, Introduction.*

"Archb. Laurence labours in the Bampton Lectures of 1804 to show that they (the 39 Articles) are *purely Lutheran.*"—Forbes, Expt. of the 39 Art., Oxford, 1809, I. vii.

"Archb. Laurence has noticed a correspondence between the article on Justification and the definition contained in Melanchthon's Loci Theologici, which together with the Lutheran tendency of some other articles would point to the influence of Cranmer and the Reformers' party. Prof. Blunt, relying on evidence adduced by the same writer, believes that Melanchthon had a voice in the drawing up of the document."—*Hardwick, p. 41.*

Hardwick, p. 33, tells us that "Henry begged from the princes of the Augsburg Confession to fulfil their former promise and send over a legation of divines (including his peculiar favorite, Melanchthon) to confer in the disputed points with a committee of English theologians. * * The Lutheran embassy arrived when a committee was nominated by the King to act as organ of the Church of England. The whole course of the discussion was apparently determined by the plan and order of the *Augsburg Confession.*"

Blakeney in the Book of Common Prayer, its History, &c., says, pp. 77, 78: "The similarity of the expressions in our articles to the Augsburg Confession, proves that our reformers agreed with Luther on some points. * * Archb. Laurence compares some of our articles with the Augsburg and Wurtemberg Confessions to show that our reformers had these formularies before them and borrowed many of their expressions in the composition of the articles. * * We not only admit the

fact but glory in it. No writer has expounded and vindicated the Scripture of Justification more clearly than Luther. The Eleventh Article sets forth his view. The Church of England on this subject is *Lutheran.*" * *

Bp. Whittingham, of Maryland, in the charge to his clergy, 1849, says "that with the Augsburg Confession their (the Thirty-Nine Articles) connection is of a nature the most intimate and direct, substantiable by superabundant evidence, both internal and circumstantial. In more than one respect the *Augsburg Confession is the source* of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England and America—their prototype in form, their model in doctrine, and the very foundation of many of their expressions; while others are drawn from its derivative expositions and repetitions."

It is not inappropriate to introduce the testimony of another distinguished witness, not of the Church of England.

"The Thirty-Nine Articles were established as the law of the land under Queen Elizabeth, in 1571. * * They are based on German Confessions of faith. Very probably the thirteen which were found among Cranmer's papers were the result of Conferences between German and English theologians, begun in Wittenberg, 1533, and continued in London in 1538, who aimed at a union of both Churches. These thirteen closely follow the order of the first seventeen Articles of the Augsburg Confession and are copied nearly word for word."—*Herzog's Encyclop.*, I. ed., vol. I. 325, which see also for the differences between the whole Thirty-Nine Articles and the Augsburg Confession.

Schaff, in Creeds of Christendom, I. 623, says:

"The Edwardine Articles were based in part, as already observed, upon a previous draft of Thirteen Articles, which was the joint product of German and English divines, and based upon the doctrinal Articles of the Augsburg Confession. Some passages were transferred verbatim from the Lutheran document to the Thirteen Articles, and from these to the Forty-Two (1553), and were retained in the Elizabethan revision (1563 and 1571). This will appear from the following comparison. The corresponding words are printed in Italics."

After giving the comparison in parallel columns, Schaff thus concludes:

"Besides these passages, there is a close resemblance in thought, though not in language, in the statements of the doctrine of original sin and of the possibility of falling after justification. Several of the Edwardine Articles * * were suggested by Article Seventeen of the Augsburg Confession, which is directed against the Anabaptists."

And finally, one extract from two of our own writers:

"As to the Twenty-Five Articles, which embody the acknowledged doctrines of the Methodist Societies, they are in language and substance, so nearly identical with the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, that they must be traced through them to the same source. They are only remoter issues from the same Lutheran fountain."

"It is, therefore, with justice that the Lutheran Church takes to herself the high appellation of *The Mother of Protestants.*"—*Seiss, Eccles. Luth., p. 124.*

"It requires no very extensive historical apparatus to trace the course of the negotiations which for some years were in progress between Henry VIII. and the members of the Smalcald League. Volumes II. and III. of Melanchthon's Works in the Corpus Reformatorum, volumes IV. and V. of De Wette's Luther's Briefen, and Seckendorf's Historia Lutheranismi afford abundant material.

"From these it appears that according to the Religious Peace of Nurenberg of July 23rd, 1532, subscription to the Augsburg Confession and the Apology was made the condition of enjoying any of the privileges of the League, and that when in 1535, the English King desired to enter it as a member, he was at once informed that an absolute prerequisite was that he should accept these two Confessions of the Lutheran churches.

"At the close of that year, Edward Fox, Bishop of Hereford, the ablest of the English theologians of his period, who had been employed by Wolsey in the negotiations with the pope concerning the King's divorce, was sent to Wittenberg with the King's chaplain, Nicholas Heath, afterwards Lord Chancellor of England, and Dr. Barnes, whose position as prior of the Augus-

tinians, and his open devotion to the doctrines of Luther rendered especially popular with the Reformers. After conferences there, a meeting of the League was held at Smalcald, where it was again laid down as the prime condition that the King 'promote the gospel of Christ according to the mode in which the princes and confederate states confessed it in the diet of Augsburg, and defended it according to the published Apology.' From January until April 1536, the English theologians were at Wittenberg in consultation with Luther and his colleagues. During their deliberations, the Augsburg Confession was examined sentence by sentence, and learned dissertations were written on points of difference, in order that if possible a common agreement might be reached. When the English theologians left, they took with them a *Repetitio* of the Augsburg Confession, prepared by Melanchthon. The English Ten Articles of 1536, in the formulation of which Bishop Fox took a prominent part, are found on examination to be taken largely from the Apology, but also incorporate material from the Augsburg Confession, and several treatises written by Melanchthon at that period. The missing *Repetitio* which had been brought from Wittenberg would probably show that that was the groundwork upon which theologians not yet purged of papal errors engrafted many of their vagaries. 'The Institution of a Christian Man,' or Bishop's Book of 1537, is in a number of places only a paraphrase of Luther's catechisms, although it has also drawn upon the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, and probably even the Smalcald Articles."—*Prof. H. E. Jacobs, D. D.*

Thus, the Lutheran Origin of the Thirty-Nine Articles has been fully illustrated. Many more extracts from the writings of great divines of the Church of England, might have been given, but they only reiterate and confirm what the earlier writers have said, and, it was deemed superfluous to insert them.

ARTICLE III.

FENELON.

By Rev. H. H. Hall, A. M., Millersburg, Ohio.

Now and then a man escapes oblivion by reason of an attribute in his nature, unusually developed, and which goes by the term goodness. In some quarters this quality is disparaged and even regarded a weakness, but it survives every other human excellence. There have been men in every calling, remarkable in this way, and when they died, the extravagant language was applied to them:

> "He made a heaven about him here,
> And took how much with him away."

It is this that impresses one in the contemplation of the Bishop of Cambray. He was the most amiable and good of all the great prelates in the time of Louis XIV. and his name, now, is the brightest and most enduring, because of his rare virtue and tenderness and love.

Francis de Salignac de la Mothe Fenelon was born at the castle of Fenelon, in Perigord, August 6, 1651. He was descended of an ancient and noble family. At the age of 12 he went to the University of Cahors, and thence to Paris, to complete his studies in philosophy. He next attended the theological school of St. Sulpice, and made such astonishing progress in the most difficult branches, that in his 15th year he preached with great applause.

Early in life he was seized by a desire to devote himself to foreign missions. The missionary calling, with its devotion and hardships, had a mighty fascination for him, because it resembled that of the apostles of old. It completely possessed him. In his day much attention was given to the conversion of Canada and the savages of the New World, and it was to this field he decided to devote himself. How different would have been his fame, destined as he was to high place and influence in an

accomplished age, had he been allowed to follow his impulse, and given himself to a work among the dusky people living in the deserts and forests of America! But, on account of poor health and the opposition of his friends, he gave up that purpose, although preaching the gospel to the heathen had, ever after, for him, a very unusual attraction. He was at once admitted into the most distinguished society, and because of his eloquence and rare charm of manners, rapidly became known to the public. At the age of 24, he took holy orders and entered upon his ministerial duties in the parish of St. Sulpice. He was sent as a missionary to several Protestant districts, and by his mildness and amiability won over many of them and quelled the tumults threatening in those parts. On his return from this mission, Louis made him preceptor to his grandsons, the dukes of Burgundy, Anjou and Berri. In 1694 he was created bishop of Cambray.

In appearance, Fenelon was very remarkable. He was tall, and had the flexibility and grace of Cicero. There was little, or none, of the animal in his physique; he was all spiritual. His bearing, conversation, the contour of his face, with its lines of graciousness, transparent eyes and noble, lofty forehead, were all harmonious and eloquent. To this was added a voice, winning, full and resonant, an originality of thought and manner and a wonderful power to please, without artfulness. Saint-Simon has this appreciative portrait of him. "That prelate was a tall, lean man, well made, pale, with a great nose, eyes from which fire and spirit streamed forth like a torrent, and a physiognomy wholly unlike any other I have ever seen, and which could never be forgotten even if you had seen it but once. All expressions were united in it, and the most dissimilar ones harmonized. It had gravity and courtesy, seriousness and gaiety; it spoke equally of the doctor, the bishop, and the great lord, but the qualities which were most conspicuous in it, as well as in his whole person, were delicacy, wit, gracefulness, propriety, and, above all, nobleness. It required an effort to cease to look at him."

As to character, Fenelon was remarkably well balanced and strong. The spirit of equity possessed him in such a degree

that he would grant no dispensation in the cases of nobles and princes, or, "officers paid by the king," which he refused to the poorest and humblest of his parish. His was a most amiable soul. In his definition of piety, he unconsciously gave much insight into his nature and life. "Piety," he said, "has nothing in it that is weak, or sad, or constrained; it enlarges the heart; it is artless and lovely; it becomes all things to all, to win them all." Somebody has declared: "The disposition of Fenelon had something in it that was sweetness itself, more patient than patience." Nor is this to be understood in the sense of too much compliance, or leniency. He knew all the while, how, without seeming to be exacting, to place his finger upon the essential points and attain them. He stated his preference without offense, but in such unmistakable terms that everybody could understand. He was always cheerful, affable and kind; and, although he had many disappointments, there is no evidence that his troubles soured him, or made him uncharitable. His rare knowledge of the world and of men caused him to cling steadfastly to his friends. He said most beautifully: "True friends make all the sweetness and all the bitterness of life," and wrote to one, of the desirability "of all good friends having an understanding to die together on the same day."

He was preëminently a pastor. The pastoral relation is a very near and intimate one. There have been times in the past when the minister of the gospel was held in awe and even fear. When he visited the home of a parishioner he did it with stern and forbidding aspect, and with an air of having all the responsibilities and sorrows of the world upon his two shoulders at once. Who does not remember, when his approach was like that of a lowering cloud, or some threatening danger? It was a signal for all cheer to depart, and for each member of the household to don a sober look and a most respectful demeanor. Newton says: "A friend of mind in passing a public house in Haworth on a Lord's Day morning saw several persons making their escape out of the lower windows, and some over a low wall; he was first alarmed fearing that the house was on fire, but upon inquiring the cause of the commotion, he was told that they saw the parson coming. They were more afraid of

their parson than of a justice of the peace." The day is gone by when the pastor can hold his place through fear, and dominate the people by virtue of his office. If he has power now, it is because he has hold of the hearts of men and lives in their regard and affection. And no man in the world has the opportunity of endearing himself to the people, which the pastor has. For the old parson who has always done his duty, in trouble and sadness, and has faithfully imparted instruction and help, there is a peculiar respect throughout the community, and the sentiment of Tennyson's line is everybody's:

"A good gray head which all men knew."

Fenelon had such modesty and grace, and, withal, such charity, as fitted him in a remarkable degree for this phase of his calling. He was perfectly adapted to humanity, and ruled by the power of the affections. He wanted to be loved and he loved in return, and in this lay his wonderful charm. The following is an extract from a Memoir of his Life: "In the course of his walks, he would often join the peasants, sit down with them on the grass, talk with them, and console them. He visited them in their cottages, seated himself at table with them, and partook of their humble meals. By such kindness and familiarity, he won their affections, and gained access to their minds. As they loved him as a father and friend, they delighted to listen to his instructions, and to submit to his guidance. Long after his death the old people who had the happiness of seeing him on these occasions, spoke of him with the most tender reverence. 'There,' they would say, 'is the chair on which our good archbishop used to sit in the midst of us; we shall see him no more,' and their tears would flow.

"The diocese of Cambray was often the theatre of war, and experienced the cruel ravages of retreating and conquering armies. But an extraordinary respect was paid to Fenelon by the invaders of France. The English, the Germans, and the Dutch rivalled the inhabitants of Cambray in their veneration for the archbishop. All distinctions of religion and sect, all feelings of hatred and jealousy that divided the nations, seemed to disappear in the presence of Fenelon. Military escorts were

offered him for his personal security, but these he declined, and traversed the countries desolated by war to visit his flock, trusting in the protection of God. In these visits his way was marked by alms and benefactions. While he was among them, the people seemed to enjoy peace in the midst of war.

"He brought together into his palace the wretched inhabitants of the country, whom the war had driven from their homes, and took care of them, and fed them at his own table. Seeing one day that one of these peasants ate nothing, he asked him the reason of his abstinence. 'Alas! my lord,' said the poor man, 'in making my escape from my cottage, I had not time to bring off my cow, which was the support of my family. The enemy will drive her away, and I shall never find another so good.' Fenelon, availing himself of his privilege of safe conduct, immediately set out, accompanied by a single servant, and drove the cow back himself to the peasant.

"'This,' said Cardinal Maury, 'is perhaps the finest act of Fenelon's life.' He adds, 'Alas! for the man who reads it without being affected.' Another anecdote, showing his tenderness to the poor, is thus related of him. A literary man, whose library was destroyed by fire, has been deservedly admired for saying, 'I should have profited but little by my books, if they had not taught me how to bear the loss of them.' The remark of Fenelon, who lost his in a similar way, is still more simple and touching, 'I would much rather they were burned than the cottage of a poor peasant.'

"The virtues of Fenelon give his history the air of romance; but his name will never die. Transports of joy were heard at Cambray when his ashes were discovered, which it was thought had been scattered by the tempest of the Revolution; and to this moment the Flemings call him 'The Good Archbishop.'"

But it has ever been the lot of good men to have enemies. Envy now sought out Fenelon, and made him the subject of the most violent persecution. And the prolific source of his troubles was the affair of Madame Guyon. This woman was young, beautiful and rich. Having become a widow at the early age of twenty-eight, she gave her three children to the care of others and relinquished herself to "divine impulses," by which is meant,

the renunciation of self and the giving up of all earthly cares and sympathies. Her soul was lifted up into a remarkable ecstasy, by her dreamy nature and ardent imagination, and such was her fervor and eloquence that she made many converts. Prayer, with her, was simply the silence of the soul absorbed in God. "Why are not simple folks so taught?" She said: "Shepherds keeping their flocks would have the spirit of the old anchorites; and laborers, whilst driving the plough, would talk happily with God: all vice would be banished in a little while and the kingdom of God would be realized on earth." Fenelon defined her doctrine of pure love in the following words: "There is an habitual state of love of God which is pure charity without any taint of self-interest. Neither fear of punishment nor desire of reward have any longer part in this love; God is loved not for the merit or the perfection or the happiness to be found in loving him." These ideas had a strange fascination for the nobler minds of that period, and among the adherents of this female mystic, were a number of ladies and their husbands at court. Indeed, some most illustrious personages, then and afterwards, were zealous advocates of her doctrines. Madame Krüdener, the Russian novelist, of remarkable intelligence and great beauty and wit, was a mystic. Sainte-Beuve calls her "the Prophetess of the North." She was the counselor of Alexander of Russia, and possessed a wide and powerful influence. Madame de Stael and her accomplished daughter the Duchess de Broglie were very strongly inclined to this faith. "Who," asks the distinguished mother, "is not profoundly affected in reading the spiritual writings of Fenelon? Where else do we discover more light, more consolation, more charity? Here is no fanaticism, no austerity other than that of virtue, no intolerance, no exclusiveness." At another time she declares: "I believe in Mysticism, that is to say, in the religion of Fenelon, that which has its sanctuary in the heart, which joins love to works." Of the daughter, the American author, Ticknor, wrote: "I have seldom seen any one with deeper and more sincere feelings of tenderness and affection, and never a French woman with stronger religious feelings. And, so, many others might be mentioned

even to Jonathan Edwards, who preached these doctrines in New England.

Now, readiness of mind is always a grand endowment. Napoleon Bonaparte thought that battles were won by the sudden flashing of an idea. He seems to have counted upon such illumination in every great emergency upon the battle field. So, readiness of mind is also a good thing in a matter of faith and Christian doctrine. In the words of Seneca: "As the immortal gods never learnt any virtue though they are endowed with all that is good; so there are some men who have so natural a propensity to what they should follow, that they learn it almost as soon as they hear it." Bossuet saw, immediately, the danger and opposed the rising enthusiasm with vehemence. The outcome of Madame Guyon's teachings is an end of repentance, no further withstanding of evil, no need of a Redeemer, and, indeed, no more responsibility for action—a man may do what he likes, his act can no longer be sin because he is absorbed in God. There are others, equally sincere and earnest, who have not this readiness of insight and foresight. They must blunder and learn by sad experience. Fenelon was one of these. Moreover, his was one of those gentle, pious natures to which the doctrines of Madame Guyon were peculiarly adapted. But, while he held to and advocated this mysticism, he did not accept the most extreme points and positions which it included. He refused his approbation of a work of Bossuet, written against Madame Guyon and her teachings, and in the same year himself published a book in which he adopted some of her tenets, especially, that love of God must be pure, disinterested and without hope of reward.

Bossuet was furious, and thoroughly aroused against his old friend and pupil. He now used all his influence to bring about his condemnation, and succeeded. Fenelon was exiled from his diocese and his book was censured. The Pope, however, with the censure, sent back to the prelates who had been so severe, the following rebuke: "He has sinned through excess of love of God, but you have sinned through lack of love for your neighbor." The way in which Fenelon received his condemnation is another grand proof of his true greatness and amiability

of disposition. He was about to ascend his pulpit and address his people upon an important subject, when a brother handed him the information, and, although the blow was severe, no one saw in his face any emotion. He knelt, for a moment, with his face in his hands, so that he might change his subject, and then discoursed upon the entire submission which was owed by all, to those who had authority in the Church. His whole flock suffered with their pastor and many were in tears when they beheld his resignation. And so he showed that his soul was greater even than his genius.

It can hardly be said that Fenelon was ever actuated by ambition. He inclined to a life of privacy and study, and his motto was, "Ama Nesciri"—Love to be unknown. In youth, his favorite retreat was the country house of Bossuet, at Germigny, near Paris, where, with other luminaries of the Church he enjoyed the leisure of that great and eloquent ecclesiastic. But there were circumstances which led him to expect advancement to high place in the government. The most fascinating man in the kingdom because of his rare charm of manners and appearance, remarkably eloquent in discourse, and possessing a genius which rose far above all by whom he was surrounded, he could not help having great admiration and influence. His influence at court rapidly increased. He had the regard and confidence of Madame de Maintenon, who herself ruled the king. Then, his extraordinary success as preceptor to the duke of Burgundy was greatly to his advantage. That young man was impetuous, fiery and indomitable. As a Christian priest, his tutor saw, at once, that religion could triumph over and subdue such a nature as the one with which he had to deal. And he judged rightly. His sympathetic nature wrought itself into the very soul of the young prince, and he became pious, "gentle, complaisant." The demon was cast out of him and he came forth "singularly well-informed, fond of study, with a refined taste in literature, with a passion for science," for which Fenelon received the genuine gratitude of all France. Again, after his exile, he would very naturally desire advancement. Promotion is vindication. Even the Psalmist prayed: "Shew me a token for good; that they which hate me may see it, and be ashamed: because thou,

Lord, hast holpen me, and comforted me." But his aspiration never caused him to wrong a single man, and it may be characterized, in the words of Lamartine, as "that species of ambition which does not seek to aggrandize its possessor, but which is involuntarily created and revealed by intellectual ability." This excellent writer goes on to say: "There are certain men whom nature has endowed with distinct privileges. Their ambition, instead of being the offspring of passion, is the emanation of mental power. They do not aspire, but they mount by an irresistible force, as the aerostatic globe rises above an element heavier than itself, by the sole superiority of specific ascendency. The very goodness of Fenelon caused him to desire some future elevation, where his benevolent spirit could shed itself with more effect upon all around him."

But he was doomed only to disappointment. The death of the grand-dauphin made his expectation seem near of realization. And the nearer the duke of Burgundy came to the throne, the more watchful and solicitous was Fenelon that he might be prepared to act well his part. He was ever giving him wise counsel and the prince listened to him with reverence and attention. The young duke, however, died, and every hope of the faithful preceptor was gone. Had the duke of Burgundy lived to occupy the throne, Fenelon would have been prime minister and France would have become a Christian republic with a supreme head. Fenelon now wrote: "All my ties are broken. I live but on affection and of affection I shall die; we shall recover ere long that which we have not lost; we approach it every day with rapid strides; yet a little while, and there will be no more cause for tears." And, when a man has been a long while the subject of buffeting and disappointment, he turns at last from the things to which he looked for satisfaction and happiness and finds what he sought elsewhere. Now, it is to others he devotes himself. Human nature robbed of all other source of joy, or motive for living, can find what it needs in a life for mankind. Then it is in himself he discovers what he wants, and is surprised at the almost boundless resources there are within him. Henceforth he is in the world and yet not of the world—he lives a life of contemplation and philosophy.

From both these sources Fenelon derived solace. He lived and worked most earnestly for others, but his experiences taught him to not depend upon men. It is the point, in noble living, to which the grandest and most Christlike have had to attain, which he describes in these words, written to a friend: "You are right in saying and believing that I ask little of men in general; I try to do much for them, and to expect nothing in return. I find a decided advantage in these terms; on these terms I defy them to disappoint me. It is only upon a very small number of true friends that I count, and I do it not from motives of interest, but from pure esteem; not from a desire to derive any advantage from them, but to do them justice in not distrusting their affection. I would like to oblige the whole human race, especially virtuous people; but there is scarcely anybody to whom I would like to be under obligation. Is it through haughtiness and pride that I think thus? Nothing could be more foolish and more unbecoming; but I have learned to know men as I have grown old, and I believe that it is the best way to do without them without pretending to superior wisdom." That, in a very great measure, was the attitude of our divine Saviour, and it is the secret of the dreadful loneliness felt by the best souls that have ever lived in this world.

The favorite ancient work of Fenelon was Horace, which he knew by heart and quoted incessantly. As a writer he had wonderful grace and fascination and elegance. In public address he had rare genius and was universally esteemed for his powers of eloquence. His "musical tones" charmed everybody. He was always original and imparted to all his thoughts such new turn, that he seemed to his hearers to be inspired and master of every science. In conversation, as well as in his discourses, he adapted himself to the man and the hour, and the sweetness of his voice and face and manner caused all to desire to be with and hear him again. The Prince de Signe distinguishes each of the great preachers of the time of Louis XIV. in these words: "Bourdaloue makes me fear everything, Massillon makes me hope everything, Bossuet astonishes me, Fenelon *touches* me." His characteristics were tenderness and gentleness. He was severe in exposing the corruptness of the

human heart, but he had an eye of pity, and an angel's compassion, as he looked upon the frailties of the race.

A paper on Fenelon would not be complete without at least a few words about the work, which, more than anything else, made him immortal. This book, although written in prose, has been justly styled poetry, and is ranked among the great epics. About its purpose and the time of its production there has been a variety of conjectures. It was written in the studious leisure of its amiable author, and in order to direct the mind and influence the heart of the royal pupil. It has a classic form, but is Christian in spirit and sentiment. Telemachus is the son of Ulysses, and goes in search of his father, who was driven by the gods from his own kingdom, the island of Ithica. While he is upon this quest, he encounters many difficulties and dangers, has numerous temptations and discouragements, but, under the faithful guidance of Wisdom, in the guise of an old man called Mentor, he comes out at last innocent, strong by experience, and an accomplished man and prince. The book is political in character, and, although imperfect in its economy, it was a revelation on some of the most important interests of the human race. Frederick the Great said once: "If I had an empire to punish I would bestow the government of it upon the philosophers." This remark applies in part to Telemachus, and yet the people were taught in it for the first time the fundamental fact of true government, that twenty millions of human beings do not exist for the gratification and glory of one man. Read in our day and with all the light of the nineteenth century, one finds much in it that is common-place, but it startled the age in which it was produced, and at that time had remarkable originality. It discovered new truth. In the words of Macaulay: "We can distinguish in it, if we are not greatly mistaken, the first faint dawn of a long and splendid day of intellectual light, the dim promise of great deliverance, the undeveloped germ of the charter and the code." It had a potent influence. It was followed by disturbance and perhaps even produced the worst evils of the Revolution. But truth is revolutionary. The very gospel of Christ set one man at variance with another and sent the sword into the world. It did its work however. Lam-

artine declares: "The times called for it; the vicissitude of glory and tyranny, the servitude and misfortunes of the nation at the end of the wars of Louis the Fourteenth, had impressed the whole mind of Europe with a sort of presentiment of this book. It contained the vengeance of the people, a lesson to kings, the inauguration of philosophy and religion in politics."

Richer and more beautiful descriptions it is impossible to find anywhere, than those which occur constantly in Telemachus. The pleasures of virtue, the scenes and experiences of pastoral life, are all most charmingly depicted. Here are two passages in illustration of the felicity of ideas and language of Fenelon. The first is from Book II. and presents a picture of Egypt: "If the sorrows of captivity had not rendered us insensible to pleasure, we must have been delighted with the prospect of this fertile country, which had the appearance of a vast garden, watered with an infinite number of canals. Each side of the river was diversified with opulent cities, delightful villas, fields that produce every year a golden harvest, and meadows that were covered with flocks: earth lavished her fruits upon the husbandman, till he stooped under the burden; and Echo seemed pleased to repeat the rustic music of the shepherds."

The second is from Book X., and surely there cannot be anything finer: "Husbandmen are always rich in proportion to the number of their children, if their prince does not make them poor; for the children afford them some assistance, even from their infancy. The youngest can drive the flock to pasture, those that are further advanced can look after the cattle, and those of the third stage can work with their father in the field. In the meantime the girls assist the mother, who prepares a simple but wholesome repast for those that are abroad, when they return home fatigued with the labor of the day. She milks her cows and her ewes; she brings out her little stores, her cheeses, and her chestnuts, with fruits that she has preserved from decay; she piles up the social fire, and the family gathers round it; every countenance brightens with the smile of innocence and peace, and some rural ditty diverts them till the night calls them to rest.

"The shepherd returns with his pipe, and to the assembled family sings some new song that he has learnt at the neighboring village. Those that have been at work in the fields come in with the plough and the weary oxen, that hang down their heads, and move with a slow and heavy pace, notwithstanding the goad, which now urges them in vain. All the sufferings of labor end with the day; the poppies which, at the command of the gods, are scattered over the earth by the hand of sleep, charm away every care; sweet enchantment lulls all nature into peace, and the weary rest, without anticipating the troubles of to-morrow.

"Happy, indeed, are those unambitious, mistrustless, artless people, if the gods vouchsafe them a king that disturbs not their blameless joy! And of what horrid inhumanity are they guilty, who, to gratify pride and ambition, wrest from them the sweet products of the field, which they owe to the liberality of nature and the sweat of their brow! In the fruitful lap of nature there is inexhaustible plenty for temperance and labor: if none were luxurious and idle, none would be wretched and poor."

Fenelon died Jan. 7, 1715, in the sixty-fourth year of his age, and it is fitting to conclude with the words of a celebrated writer quoted several times already: "Conscience owes him an additional virtue—toleration; thrones, another duty—the love of the people; republics, an added glory—humanity. France has possessed bolder natures, but she has given us none so full of tenderness. If genius acknowledged a sex, it might be said that Fenelon had the imagination of a woman to dream of heaven, and her soul to love the earth. When we pronounce his name, or open his book, we fancy that we look on his face, and persuade ourselves that we hear the voice of a friend. What quality of fame can surpass this love in veneration and solid value?

"The epitaph of Fenelon might be written in these words: 'There are men who have made France more feared or renowned, but none have rendered her more beloved by other nations.'"

ARTICLE IV.

THE "FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES" OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL.

By M. VALENTINE, D. D., LL. D., Gettysburg, Pa.

It is now about twenty years since the General Council was organized. It came into existence in the midst of heated conflicts and passionate controversy. The time since elapsed has been sufficient for two things. *First*, to permit the feelings of those times to subside into a calmness more favorable to impartial and correct judgment; and *secondly*, to develop and exhibit the actual character of the foundations on which the new organization was formed. This latter result appears particularly in the progress of discussion and action by which the question and practice of pulpit and altar fellowship are reaching settlement and in the recent widely published explanations and defense of "The Fundamental Principles" by the Norton Professor in the Theological Seminary at Philadelphia.

Not at all in the spirit of controversy, but of calm and fitting examination and discussion, it is here proposed to look at some features of these "Fundamental Principles," as these twenty years have served to make known their actual character as a confessional basis. The purpose is not at all to discuss the doctrines of the Lutheran Church, nor our duty as Lutherans to maintain them. This duty is recognized. But assuming a common and true acceptance of the Lutheran doctrines, the question will concern rather the proper ecclesiastial position which true fidelity should take for the best life and work of our Church in this land.

Only two points are to be brought under review. These will be sufficient to show the salient and ruling conceptions by which the organization has fixed and marked its ecclesiastical position, and would, if possible, mark the whole Lutheran Church of our land, and by which we may judge whether that position presents our Church altogether in her proper character and right

attitude. These two points are, *first*, the exclusive relation established towards other parts of the Church of Christ, and *secondly*, the denial of the principle of doctrinal development or modification within our Church. These points must be looked at separately and in their joint significance.

I. The exclusive relation of the Lutheran Church to the rest of the Church catholic, required under the Fundamental Principles. It is assumed in this discussion that this relation may be learned from the interpretation authoritatively given of the Principles since their adoption. This interpretation, even if not the necessary or true one, yet since solemnly adopted and proclaimed, must be taken as actually marking the organization.

In looking at the Fundamental Principles themselves we might not only fail to get the separatistic idea or purpose from them, but innocently take them as setting forth the very opposite. The first Principle reads:

"There must be, and abide through all time, one holy Christian Church, which is the assembly of all believers, among whom the gospel is purely preached and the holy sacraments are administered as the gospel requires.

"To the true unity of the Church it is sufficient that there be agreement touching the doctrine of the gospel, that it be preached in one accord, in its pure sense, and that the sacraments be administered comformably to God's word."

This is a clear and just statement, drawn from the Augsburg Confession, of the doctrine concerning the Church, in the character in which we say: "We believe in one holy catholic [Christian] Church." This is the Church which Christ loved and for which He gave himself that he might sanctify and cleanse it by the washing of water with the word—being not simply the Church invisible, for it is marked as manifested in the preaching of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments. This Church is conceded to be *one*—"one holy Christian Church," the one body of which Christ is the Head,—1 Cor. 12 : 3, Ep. 1 : 22, 23. What is sufficient for this unity is distinctly defined: "agreement touching the doctrine of the gospel, that it be preached in one accord, in its pure sense, and that the sacraments be administered conformably to God's word." It will not be questioned that the first of the Fundamental Principles

refers to the Church in this sense, or that in making a distinct article of it the Church catholic is recognized as larger and more inclusive than the Lutheran or any particular Church. It assumes, too, that the whole Church consists of the believers which form the parts found in the particular Churches, and thus lays the basis for finding true *churchly* character in the particular organizations. There *is* a holy catholic Church, as a precondition for parts of it. This first Principle, therefore, recognizes the Church in that conception in which the doctrine concerning it is fundamental.

The second of the Fundamental Principles then proceeds to define the true unity of a "*particular Church*," not, of course, as outside of, but in, the unity of the "one holy Christian Church:"

"The true unity of a particular Church, in virtue of which men are truly members of one and the same Church, and by which any Church abides in real identity, and is entitled to a continuation of her name, is unity in doctrine and faith and in the sacraments, to wit: That she continues to teach and to set forth, and her true members embrace from the heart, and use, the articles of faith and the sacraments as they were held and administered when the Church came into distinctive being and received a distinctive name."

It is to be distinctly observed and borne in mind that the "particular Church" is a true part of the "one holy catholic Church." For in the next Principle such Churches are expressly put in this relation of consistent and integral parts of the general or universal unity:

"The unity of the Church is witnessed to, and made manifest in, the solemn, public and official Confessions which are set forth, to wit: The generic unity of the Christian Church in the general Creeds, and the specific Unity of pure parts of the Christian Church in their specific Creeds; one chief object of both classes of which Creeds is, that Christians who are in the Unity of faith may know each other as such, and may have a visible bond of fellowship."

This language clearly recognizes, what is unquestionably true, that the Christian Church is marked both by generic unity and by specific unities, and that the differences between the specific Creeds of the parts do not amount to a nullification of the really Christian and church character of those parts. It acknowledges,

too, that the oneness of the whole Church is to be "*witnessed to*" and "*made manifest*" as truly and distinctly as is the oneness of any part, and is to be neither set aside nor obscured by the existence of the parts. The acceptance of the œcumenical Creeds by the particular Churches is, according to this Principle, their "public and official" profession of unity and union with the "one holy Christian Church." And, according to a conceded principle, these œcumenical Creeds, because of their peculiar and paramount authority, have paramount force for the generic unity for which they stand. For *Hutter* well expresses what may be justly taken as the consensus of our theologians, when he says: "*Those symbols which have been approved by the unanimous consent of the whole Church* (*to which class belong the three œcumenical symbols*) *have far greater authority than those which have been received only by particular Churches.*"* The clear light of this principle forbids us to treat the "specific" witness as everything and the "generic" as nothing, or to intensify the specific into a repudiation of the œcumenical unity or fellowship. These portions of the Fundamental Principles unmistakably recognize the truth that the actual organization of Christendom into its different particular Churches is not to be held as destructive of the Church's generic unity. In asserting the place and right of particular Churches, they do not forget or deny the fundamental oneness in which God's Church is still to be made "manifest." On the contrary, they find the legitimacy and right relation of the particular Churches in the fact that they are "parts" of the one great divine unity. They mark the parts as parts of the whole, and assume that that which is not a part of the œcumenical Church is not a Christian Church at all.

This unquestionably correct teaching is both emphasized and thrown into still clearer light by the affirmation which the third Principle adds concerning the "object" of Creeds: "One *chief* object of *both* classes of which Creeds [the general and specific] is, that Christians who are in the unity of faith *may know each other as such*, and may have *a visible bond of fellowship*." The fulness of this terse affirmation appears under analysis. 1. One

*Compend of Theology, Art. I., 15.

"*chief*" object of the Creeds is declared. 2. This object is affirmed of "*both*" classes of Creeds, of the œcumenical no less than of the specific. 3. This object is twofold: *First*, "that Christians who are in the unity of faith may *know each other as such*," *i. e.*, as Christians, in their relation at once to the common faith of the Church and to their specific faith; and *secondly*, that "*Christians may have a visible bond of fellowship*," *i. e.*, not only with a particular Church by the specific Creed, but with the "*one holy Christian Church*" by the œcumenical. The normal and true relation of Christians, as here taught, and taught correctly, is in "*visible bond of fellowship*" with the Church catholic as well as with "a particular Church." The particular Churches thus *establish* themselves in this bond of unity, and pledge themselves to *maintain* it in proper manifestation.

But it now appears that this obvious sense of these first three of the Fundamental Principles, laying a clear basis for Lutheran fellowship with other parts of the Christian Church, is not the true one of *all the Principles taken together*, or at least, not that which they are construed to mean, and declared, by the General Council, to bind those who accept the ecclesiastical position they set forth. The restrictive principle seems to have been incorporated in other portions of the Principles, in the absolute way in which all the statements of the whole Book of Concord are made confessional as "of necessity pure and scriptural," "in the perfect harmony of one and the same scriptural faith." The "Missourians" and some others saw the sanction which the first three of the Principles furnished for possible "fellowship" with other "particular Churches," involved in this way of joining these churches in the "one holy catholic Church" with its wide "communion of saints"—or if preferred, *as* "the communion of saints"—and fearing the leaven of "unionism," recoiled from uniting with the new organization, without more distinct guarantees. Other Synods faltered. The long and painful process of settling the question of Pulpit and Altar Fellowship has shown both the difficulties of the task of fixing the exclusive rule into the requirement of the Fundamental Principles, in the face of the first three of them, and at the same time, the General Council's steadily growing purpose to do so. At its

first meeting (Fort Wayne, 1866) it was "not prepared to endorse" the Iowa Synod's jugdment against pulpit and altar fellowship with non-Lutherans, "as the correct logical deduction and application of the negative part of our Confessional Books."* Two years later it affirmed "the principle of discriminating as over against an indiscriminate communion," and the exclusion of "heretics and fundamental errorists."† In 1869, it indicated that the "final decision" was not yet made; and the next year at Lancaster, O., it proceeded to define "fundamental errorists" in terms which make them, in substance, those who wilfully and persistently desert in whole or in part the faith as set forth in the Confessions of the Lutheran Church.‡ At Akron, O., in 1872, it formally adopted "The Rule: *Lutheran Pulpits are for Lutheran ministers only—Lutheran altars are for Lutheran communicants only*," with exceptions in the sphere, not of right, but of privilege, to be determined in consonance with these principles by the conscientious judgment of pastors as cases arise.§ The statement of this rule was completed at Galesburg, in 1875, by connecting with it the words: "which accord with the word of God and with the Confessions of our Church,"|| which insertion was, a year later, declared not to make any change in the rule itself as formulated at Akron, but simply to state "the source of the rule," viz., "the word of God and the Confessions of our Church."¶

Dr. Krauth's 105 Theses, prepared at the request of the General Council, are the twisted links of the curious reasoning by which this Galesburg Rule has been acceptably shown to be the true, native and original sense of the Council's confessional basis. "The Galesburg Declaration," says Dr. Krauth, "is the natural and proper *outcome* of all the previous tendency and acts of the General Council, beginning with its Fundamental Principles of Faith and Polity.** Though the rule has not been made "coercive," it has been adopted and put forth by the Council itself as the true interpretation and real meaning of its confessional basis, and made "educational" for the practice of the Church.

*Minutes, p. 19. †Minutes of 1868, p. 23. ‡Minutes, pp. 35, 36.
§Minutes, p. 47. ||Minutes, p. 17. ¶Minutes of 1876, pp. 25–30.
**Thesis, 20.

By reiterated interpretation of the sense of its fundamental law, the Council has given it the place and authority of an accepted confessional principle, with earnest calls for conformity of practice to it.

All this obliges us to look upon the General Council as *in fact* established by its Fundamental Principles in this exclusive relation to other Churches. This relation is assumed all through the labored explanation and defense of them by Dr. Jacobs, Norton Professor in the Philadelphia Seminary, in a lengthened series of articles in *The Lutheran* of last year. In his first article, conceiving of the Council's basis under the Galesburg interpretation, and referring to the generic doctrinal unity of the Church catholic, he makes the sweeping assertion that "if there be dissent touching the doctrine of the gospel, the separation has already occurred against which all faithful witnesses of Christ must give their testimony," even to the 'abandoning of the persistent dissentients to their fate.' It is very easy, if this asserted principle be once admitted in its sweeping terms as an absolute rule with respect to dissent from the œcumenical Creeds, afterwards quietly, but without right, to extend the conclusion, as Dr. Jacobs seems to do all through his discussion, to the whole ground sought to be covered by it. But the assertion is only partially true in the relation in which it is so broadly affirmed, the relation of dissent from the consensus of the Christian faith as set forth in the œcumenical Creeds. And when the dissent is only from portions of the *particular Creeds*, it is not only unproved, but demonstrably *untrue*. Two things are strangely disregarded in the assertion and application of such an absolute principle. *First*, that such absolute and extreme testimony, by withdrawal of all fellowship, can have no just place in the interest of the *specific* Creeds, and is misapplied when the dissent is within the allowance of the conceded generic unity of the "one holy Christian Church." The specific witness only covers the ground of the specific differences—the specific differences within the recognized pure or true parts of the Church. The idea of first acknowledging the parts as *within* the generic unity and then witnessing against them as *out* of the

Church, already "separated," to be "left to their fate," is grotesque enough as a specimen of logic, to say nothing of the wrong it does to the brotherhood of believers. *Secondly*, that dissentient interpretations of many features of gospel truth have, in fact, always had place within the Church, that while in essentials unity has been required, in non-essentials there has been liberty. It depends on *what* the "dissent" touches, and what relation it bears to the vital and necessary features of doctrine. The Church has never confounded, as this recent reasoning does, the distinction between allowable diversity in sincere holding of the truth in Jesus and a rejection of fundamentals which becomes heresy and can be permitted to stand only outside of the communion of the Christian Church. The looseness which talks about "dissent touching the doctrine of the gospel" as already a "separation," without defining the relations or extent of the dissent—a feature that runs through and vitiates the whole discussion referred to—can lead to no trustworthy conclusions in this matter. So far from no dissent being allowed, the very relation asserted in Fundamental Principles, I., II. and III. concedes that the entire body of diversities within the "pure parts" must be allowed place in the aggregate Church.

This confounding of the distinction, which needs always to be kept clear, between the scope and force of the unities represented and asserted by the general and special Creeds respectively, marks the whole argumentation of Dr. Jacobs' explanation. Under the principle of exclusive witness, drawn so sweepingly, against what the *œcumenical* consensus puts outside of the Church, the *specific* Creed is hastily applied so as to treat dissent from its peculiar points as also putting the dissentients outside of the Church—outside, not of the particular Church alone, but of the one holy Christian Church, which measures the true scope of "the communion of saints." Despite the fact that the Principle affirms that "one object of *both* classes of creeds is that Christians who are in the unity of faith *may know each other as such, and may have a visible bond of fellowship*," the interpretation established by the Council and defended by Dr. Jacobs, makes required testimony against other "parts" practically wipe out or forbid recognition of the "visible bond of fellowship."

This "one chief object" of the œcumenical Creeds is no sooner affirmed than it is excluded from actual force or visible manifestation, and a law of "no-fellowship" is put in its place.

It is this inexcusable confounding of the unity of a particular Church, in its narrow and subordinate place, with the divine unity of the whole Christian Church, and the consequent treating of denominational differences as fundamental heresy, that is illustrated in the glaring perversion and wrong of invoking Gal. 1 : 6–9 in justification of the rigid and intolerant exclusion of fellowship between the different "parts" of the Church of Christ. One gets weary of seeing this and parallel texts made to do forced service in a relation in which they have no applicability. They do, indeed, sustain a principle of "discriminating" over against "indiscriminate" fellowship, excluding what is in fact fundamental heresy; but until it be shown that the erroneous teaching is such that it preaches "another gospel, which is not another," *i. e.*, teaching which subverts the doctrine of salvation by grace, 'overthrowing,' as Luther says, 'the gospel of Christ,'* the passages must be held to be utterly inadequate to establish this extreme sectarian exclusiveness, or rule of non-fellowship between the great historic Churches of recognized orthodox Protestantism.

But without inquiring further how the Galesburg Rule came to be established, accepted and defended as the logical and necessary outcome of the General Council's Principles of Faith and Polity, it is enough that in fact it has been so established. The Council has framed its confessional basis into a rule of disallowing pulpit and altar fellowship with non-Lutheran Churches. The rule has been affirmed as a "confessional principle."† This fact has been thus recalled, in the connections of its development, in order to invite attention to what it involves. By inexorable logic, two things are inevitable.

1. That the position of the General Council involves a *contradiction* to what its own leading Principles set forth, the existence of "pure parts" of the "one holy Christian Church" in

*On Gal. 1 : 7.

†Minutes of Council at Akron, pp. 46, 47. Dr. Krauth's *Theses*, 21.

unity with which it asserts for the Lutheran Church a place. It distinctly assumes that there *are* other parts, and positively asserts for our Church the place of one part. The fifth Principle designates the Evangelical Lutheran Church as "a portion of the holy Christian Church." The "parts" mentioned are, of course, not to be viewed as simply imaginary, but as veritable facts in the actual organization of Christendom. Yet in spite of the confession of particular Churches, as real parts having their right relation in the true visible bond of œcumenical unity, the Council's Principles, *as interpreted by itself*, require it to refuse open recognition of the divine reality. It establishes the unity only to turn round and disown it or refuse it any legitimate manifestation. The entire manifestation allowed in the actual relation must be made to consist in repudiating any condemnatory testimony. For, let the facts in the case be distinctly understood and measured. In the forty-eighth of the 105 Theses on the Galesburg Rule, Dr. Krauth well says: "There are *three* general *ways* in which the sense of unity in the Church can be *officially expressed*. *One* is by profession of the same Creed, the *second* by admission to public teaching, the *third* is by reception at the altar." In the position assumed by the General Council *all these three* ways of official expression of oneness,—by Confession, by admission to pulpit, and by admission to altar—are turned in declaration of rejection, separation and exclusion. For, the fraction of recognition in the one way, through the generic part of the creed confession, is thoroughly annulled in the emphasis and ruling force given to specific and divisive testimony. Instead of permitting the generic testimony, as by conceded right it ought, to establish and maintain a "visible bond of fellowship," confessionalism is made supreme for wiping out all visible fellowship. The method "by creed" is used so as to show effect only in the specific and divisive side, and to turn the other two ways of testimony into testimony of division and non-recognition. The General Council has thus evidently included conflicting fundamental principles in its basis. After beginning with the truth of the unity of the "one holy Christian Church," witnessed to through acceptance of the general Creeds, in order that "Christians" might know each other, and have a "visible bond of fel-

lowship," in it at once, while asserting for the Lutheran Church the place of one of the "pure parts" of the Church, adds the rule of disallowing that fellowship through all the ways in which it may be officially expressed.

2. That the General Council's principle of exclusion of fellowship with other parts of the Church practically *asserts for the Lutheran Church the attitude and character of a schism*—a schism by self-exclusion from communion with the Church catholic. It withdraws from that which it interprets and confesses to be "the communion of saints." For this "communion of saints" stands identified with, or fulfilled in, the "generic unity." It is unquestionably commensurate with the "holy Christian Church." To establish a separate exclusive communion is withdrawal from that generic unity and communion. The unity or oneness of the Christian Church, of course, does not cease to exist because its communion is ignored, and the only result can be that our Church, if this scheme be accepted, must take the attitude of a schism. What makes it worse is that the rent is made right at the altar of the Church's sacramental unity: "*For we are one bread and one body*," 1 Cor. 10 : 17.

There can be no evading of this conclusion. And the question comes up right here: Is this the proper and best ground for our Lutheran Church in this country to assume? Rather, we must ask, can it be *right* or without sin, thus to enact or endorse schism in "the body of Christ?" Is it right or consistent, to confess solemnly the "one holy Christian Church" and affirm our relation as an integral part of it, continually repeating the acknowledgment and claim in our Churches through the use of the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds, and at the same time insist on refusing to hold or allow fellowship with it in the divinely appointed forms of word and sacraments? Is it the true and best position, by such disruption of fellowship with the rest of the Church in both the word and sacraments, or in the pulpit and at the altar, to discard for our Church all manifestation of living oneness with it and take the character of schismatic separatism? Are we prepared for such a declaration of independence and isolation of our Church from the whole brotherhood of believers? Are we ready for this decree of visible separation? Is it

justifiable, or the best manifestation of the true and required spirit of Christian fraternity, to deny fellowship with other "particular Churches" though confessing agreement in most of the great doctrines of redemption and grace—all the essentials of the saving gospel—by acceptance of which these Churches are acknowledged by us all as Churches of Christ, but on the basis of the diversity of view on a few doctrines, however important we may esteem them or however intense may be our "convictions" of the correctness of our view of them, to deny the sacred fellowship of the Church or disrupt the relation of divinely established unity of the parts? Is this the best way to promote or exhibit the oneness of the Church—the obligation to do which the Holy Spirit seems to be now more strongly than ever impressing on the heart of Christendom? If the crisis of the Reformation, in its violent doctrinal controversies and strifes, threw the particular Churches into inter-relation of non-communion in pulpit and altar, that extreme antagonism, even if counted excusable under the circumstances, need not be perpetuated forever to the discredit of Christian brotherhood and injury to the cause of Christ.

Most, if not all of us in the General Synod, and many, we doubt not, in the General Council, do not believe that this extreme breach of fellowship ought to be permanent or that this intolerant, exclusive position is the right or the best for our great and growing Lutheran Church to take in this age and this land. And we believe this with an intensity and sincerity of "conviction" that is as much entitled to respect as are the "convictions" which are offered as necessitating the rule of the Council. The more we love the doctrines of our Church, the mother Church of the Reformation, with right to stand as the very heart of Christendom, the more unwilling are we to have it hold an attitude so in conflict with the true œcumenical communion of saints. It is gratifying to be able to recall the fact that in the mind of the great patriarch of our Church in this land, fidelity to its Confession required no such exclusivism as the Council's Rule. Henry Melchior Mühlenberg, laying the foundations of Lutheran organization and practice in our country, laid them in a truer and sweeter catholicity and breadth of

Christian fellowship, as is abundantly evident from the *Hallische Nachrichten*, and distinctly acknowledged in the recent biography by Dr. W. J. Mann.* Dr. Mann's book has put beyond further dispute the fact of Mühlenberg's fraternal relations and pulpit fellowship with ministers of other denominations. This exclusive and separatistic feature of the Council's organization does not commend to us its Fundamental Principles. Though extolled in glowing phrase as the true basis for union of all Lutherans—with recent signs of irritation that their excellence or perfection should be at all questioned—their reception is found to involve meanings and consequences which our Church in this land must hesitate long before accepting. Rather, we should say, we ought unhesitatingly to refuse to accept such a basis for our Church. We long for a better union and harmony of our Church in this country, but if that union is possible only on this intolerant separatistic position, we are content that it should remain a bright dream unrealized.

II. The second point to which attention is to be called, is that the Fundamental Principles seek to place the Lutheran Church in false relation to the principle and law of doctrinal development which belongs to the "one holy Christian Church."

The Form of Concord itself presents the true conception and force of Confessions:

"We believe, teach and confess that the only rule and standard according to which at once all dogmas and teachers should be esteemed and judged are nothing else than the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and of the New Testament. Other writings of ancient or modern teachers, whatever reputation they may have, should not be regarded as of equal authority with the Holy Scriptures, but should altogether be subordinated to them, *and should not be received other or further than as witnesses in what manner and at what place, since the time of the apostles, the [purer] doctrine of the prophets and apostles was preserved.* * * The Holy Scriptures alone remain the only judge, rule and standard, according to which, as the only teststone, all dogmas should and must be discerned and judged, as to whether they be good or evil, right or wrong. But the other symbols and writings cited are not judges as are the Holy

**The Life and Times of Henry Melchior Mühlenberg*, pp. 388–393, 406, 463.

Scriptures, *but only a witness and declaration of the faith, as to how at any time the Holy Scriptures have been understood and explained in the articles in controversy in the Church of God by those who then lived.*"*

The specific points in this clearly are, 1. That the Holy Scriptures alone and always are the rule and standard by which all dogmas must be discerned and judged. 2. That all Creeds are but human statements of the way in which the Church, either œcumenical or particular, *understands and accepts* the teaching or truth of God's word. 3. That the symbols belong to place, time or age, according as the Church, under the help of the Holy Spirit and the fuller experience of the truth, may be enabled to hold it fast as previously confessed or put it into fuller and more accurate expression. 4. That Confessions, as formal statements "how, at any time or place, the Holy Scriptures have been understood and explained," are *not*, as to their form, of *unchangeable* permanence, so as forever to exclude modifications or additions which shall express a more accurate or fuller understanding by the Church. The right, if not the duty, of the Church is distinctly and unmistakably implied, to hold its confessional statements subject to whatever modifications the Holy Scriptures may require according to the Church's growing understanding and experience of the gospel.

Let it be distinctly understood here, that the writer does not believe our Confession now needs any change. Under attained exegesis of the word he believes it does not. But he is concerned here with a great principle of both dogmatic and confessional theology. The statements quoted from the Form of Concord concededly present the correct teaching of our Church on this point. But if this teaching be the true Lutheran view, it will become evident, we believe, that the view sought to be made law by the Fundamental Principles of the General Council is not Lutheran—nor Protestant.

It is conceded by all that while the truths of Christianity were given in their completeness in the Holy Scriptures, the Church's apprehension of them has been gradual and progressive through the Christian centuries. All the great doctrines of the gospel

*Dr. Jacobs' Translation, Int. I. and III.

have been developed step by step, in more accurate and fuller form. There have been revision, modification, completer and more precise statement, both of the separate truths and of their relation to each other. This has been so marked a feature of Christian theology that no one can question it. The whole history of doctrine is an illustration and proof of it.

Equally unquestionable is it that Luther and his co-laborers recognized this principle of development and treated all other writings than the Scriptures as subject to the rectification and expansion called for by the word of God. Luther held fast to the old œcumenical Creeds because he saw they expressed the true doctrine of the divine word, but where the decrees of popes, councils, or of the Church in any way, were in conflict with the Scriptures or fell short of their teaching, they were unhesitatingly set aside or amended. Nothing was to have final or unchangeable authority but the word of God. The whole Reformation and Protestantism came by the application of this principle. The Lutheran Confessions themselves are a result and proof of it. They have their existence and legitimacy by it. For it Luther was ready to go to prison or stake. On no other principle could the Lutheran Church ever have obtained "distinctive being" or right to represent a true reformation of genuine Christianity out of the inspired Scriptures, and in conformity to the simple early creeds. We are not at liberty to take the formulated results alone of the Reformation, and discard the principle in and under which they were reached and set forth. That is the old blunder of sawing off the limb on which we are sitting. If there is one principle which the great work of God in the 16th century enthroned as duty for the Church, it is the obligation to hold its confessional statements amenable to the correcting and developing light of God's word, under the Church's continued examination and experience of its divine meaning and power. The theologians of the Form of Concord themselves assumed this principle of development and rested the legitimacy of their own work on it. That it is a valid and vital one for the "one holy Christian Church" on earth, even to

the end is, indeed, indisputable, and need not be further vindicated.

That this law of development of doctrine and amenability of creed statements to the demands of the Scriptures, in the Church's growing understanding of them belongs also to the "true parts" or "particular Churches," is clear from the living indissoluble relation between them. Each of the true parts carries the true attributes of the whole. Happily we need not go far for authorities which will not be questioned in this connection. Quotations from several will be enough.

Müller, in his historico-theological introduction to the *Symbolical Books*, after maintaining the authority of church symbols, proceeds to define the sense and limitations of this authority, evidently in relation to both general and specific creeds:

"Yet she [the Church] ascribes eternal [ewige] authority not to these, but to the word of God alone. * * And Luther himself says in reference to the Augsburg Confession, 'We shall hold on to it, until the Holy Ghost shall give us a better one.' The Church then does *not wish to ascribe to her symbols immutable authority; she admits that some one might discover a defect in them; she finds them merely a temporary expression of her faith; she reserves to herself expressly the privilege of improving them, of completing, or of extending, as occasional necessity may require.*"*

On the subject of confessional modification so as to obtain a final union of the great Protestant Churches, Müller adds:

"We confess that any one bears the Christian name unmerited, who does not at this day from the bottom of his heart desire this true internal union of the separate Confessions; indeed we are convinced from John 10 : 16 that the Lord in due time will bring about this desirable union in the Church. But He only can effect it."

Dr. Jacobs, in the second volume, of his recently published edition of the *Book of Concord*, has inserted an extract from Dr. G. L. Plitt's *Introduction to the Augustana* on *The Principle of Confessional Development.* Dr. Plitt was one of the staunchest defenders of strict confessional Lutheranism. He presents the general principle of development and treats it as applicable to

*New Market Translation, p. 16.

all Church confessions. We quote at length, italicising for the purpose of calling attention to the salient ideas:

"A doctrine of the Church is the result of the Church's consideration of her own nature, *i. e.*, of the communion of man with God which is realized in her, and which by her service is being fulfilled to an always increasing extent. It is the facts of her experience of salvation which the Church, so far as she has become acquainted with them, brings into expression. In making the limitation 'so far as she has become acquainted with them,' we thereby declare that this doctrine of the Church, does not, in its entire extent, originate all at once. The Church is immediately certain of her salvation, which is decided in the person of Jesus Christ, her living Head. But Jesus Christ is an historical person, the goal of a series of facts of salvation tending toward Himself, and the beginning of another series arising with Himself. It is this rich diversity included in that living unity which should become the subject of the Church's knowledge, and which she should clothe in expressions designating its true nature. * *

"The knowledge of these manifold facts is only very gradually attained. * * The particular agents of this work of attaining knowledge are persons standing in the faith of the Church and constrained by God's Spirit, as God generally effects all progress in church history through persons filled with the Spirit. * * Moreover, since the Church is no longer at the beginning of her development and of her activity in the framing of dogmas, these agents will enter into close connection with the past of the Church, and, appropriating what the Church has received from the labor of the fathers as a permanent possession of knowledge, will make still further inquiry. * * The results of this new inquiry, produced by the same Spirit, will connect themselves in a homogeneous manner with those which precede, in every case *carrying them towards completion, and perhaps correcting them.* They fulfill this office of completing when they are occupied with a new and hitherto not yet especially cultivated object of knowledge, *or when in them an earlier work is again taken up which at that time, for some reason or other, did not come to a satisfactory conclusion. In the latter case the further development may be a necessary correction of the earlier.* * * *

"As much as the fact should be emphasized that the Confessions originate under the guidance of the divine Spirit, *yet it must never be forgotten that, since they were composed by men, they must be imperfect, and therefore not only capable of, but need*

development and improvement. * * In the Church, as long as it struggles in the flesh, there is still sin, and even its most spiritual members, the foremost soldiers of the times, who direct the framing of Confessions, are not free from this disease. Their knowledge, as also that of the Church, is always somewhat clouded by sin, and therefore they not only remain imperfect, but may even be infected with error. *Application of this is to be made also to the symbols.*

"*At all events, the position stands firm that no symbol, even though it were up to the present time the most perfect, has an unlimited validity.*

Thus writes this earnest Lutheran, in words so sound and important that they are deemed entitled to a place in this companion volume of *The Book of Concord.*"* They well express the fully established consensus of theology on the subject. The only wonder is that Dr. Jacobs was able, despite the incongruity, to publish them in the same volume with the Council's Fundamental Principles. The distinct points of their teaching are:

1. That the principle of doctrinal and dogmatic development, by a growing knowledge of the completed word of God, *belongs, as a vital principle, to the "holy Christian Church."*

2. That the Church's Confessions are to be made to give expression to this ever completing progress in the truth, made possible by God's providence and Spirit in the experiences and history of the Church.

3. That this development is in the way both of *correction* of earlier confessional statement, and of carrying preceding *imperfect statements toward completion.*

4. That since all confessions are "*composed by men, they must be imperfect, and therefore not only capable of, but need development and improvement.*"

5. That "*the position stands firm that no symbol, even though it were up to the present time the most perfect, has unlimited validity.*"

6. That it is the Church's duty, marking its living fidelity to Christ, to *keep its confessions always in harmony with its attained undestanding of the fundamental truths of the divine word.*

Compare, now, with this unquestionable, great principle of

*pp. 312–319.

development and the right place and force of Creeds, the position in which the Fundamental Principles of the Council would put our Church. We quote the Principles:

II. "The true unity of a particular Church, in virtue of which men are truly members of one and the same Church, *and by which any Church abides in real identity, and is entitled to a continuation of her name*, is unity in doctrine and faith and in the sacraments, to wit: That *she continues to teach and to set forth, and that her true members embrace from the heart, and use, the sacraments as they were held and administered when the Church came into distinctive being and received a distinctive name.*"

IV. "That confessions may be such a testimony of unity and bond of union, *they must be accepted in every statement of doctrine in their own true, native, original and only sense.* Those who set them forth and subscribe them *must not only agree to use the same words, but must use and understand those words in one and the same sense.*"

V. "The unity of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, as a portion of the holy Christian Church, *depends upon her abiding in one and the same faith, in confessing which she obtained her distinctive being and name, her political recognition, and her history.*"

When put together these several affirmations unquestionably construct the following aggregate law:

1. That a "particular Church" can maintain its unity and identity and right to its name *only by continuing to hold and teach in every respect precisely as it did at first.*

2. That this sameness of required teaching must cover "*every statement of doctrine.*"

3. That, as between those who "set forth" the symbols and those who "subscribe" them, there must be agreement to use and understand "*the same words in one and the same sense.*"

4. That this "sense" must be the "*native*" and "*original*" sense, "*when the Church came into distinctive being.*"

The logic by which the Fundamental Principles reach this extreme and astonishing position, in complete violation of the established principle of development and the place and authority of confessions, is not distinctly indicated. They seem, however, to rest the conclusion, somehow or other, on the principle of "*identity,*" which is plausibly invoked; and both Dr. Krauth in his *Conservative Reformation*, and Dr. Jacobs in his defence of the

"Principles"* appear to assume this as putting such conclusion beyond question. The used of the principle of identity here has indeed a plausible look; but the plausibility falls far short of conclusiveness the moment it is tested. For, what is "identity?" In what does it consist? Every one knows that the term has different significations and force according as it is applied to different subjects. Identity may be affirmed of persons, or of things, or of general conceptions or logical concepts. When applied to *concepts*, the products of our thought-power, formed of a single attribute or as a generalized complex of attributes, the law of identity permits no change. The concept loses its identity if a single attribute be withdrawn or added. When affirmed of *living things*, however, as a tree or animal, where the sameness consists simply in the continuity of the life and organization, some change in growth and form is consistent with continued identity. But in still greater measure is this the case, when identity is asserted of *persons*. Personal identity persists completely through all changes of view and character. A man may modify his convictions, alter his beliefs, change his character, undergo a thorough revolution in judgment, feeling and life, and yet remain the same man. His identity abides forever in his intelligent, self-directive personality. The continuity of the Church, consisting of believers united with Christ in the word and sacraments, follows the law of personal identity. It has its movement and character in the sphere of intelligent freedom. Its identity is that of collective personality, not of concepts or things. Under self-regulating liberty, enlightened by the Holy Spirit, it may advance in knowledge, correct errors, and modify or advance its confessions in increasing conformity to the divine word. This is the sphere which God has assigned to the Church's intelligence and duty. To assume that it forfeits its identity by doing this, would make its task or duty impossible. Neither the name "Christian" nor "Lutheran," can vacate this principle. It was with this progress of confessional development before it, that the Church assumed the name Christian. It was under this law that the main continuity of the

---

* *The Lutheran*, April 22, 1886.

Christian Church as revived in the Reformation, was made bearer of the name Lutheran. It is only sophistry that can claim that a particular Church, by the merely incidental feature of a name, which forms no part of its substantial character, and which may have been affixed to it by its enemies, is excluded from this law of development and fidelity in which God has set the intelligence and will of his whole Church to its true mission and action.

But without inquiring further as to the reasons which led the framers of the Fundamental Principles to cut off, in this absolute way, the Lutheran Church, and all "particular Churches," from the right of theological and confessional development, and restrict it and them irrevocably and forever to the "same words" in the "same sense," unmodified, in which it first uttered its understanding of the word of God, we wish the full import of such position to be looked at:

First, that the position of the Fundamental Principles *is in contradiction of the well established Lutheran view as to the authority, place and force of Church Confessions, and at variance with the whole Protestant principle on the subject.*

Secondly, that in this exclusion of the law of development or possible modification, the Fundamental Principles *deny to the Lutheran Church the action of one of the forever characterizing principles and marks of the "one holy Christian Church."*

Thirdly, that such denial to it of the right of sharing in the action of this principle, removing from it one of the attributes of the true Christian Church, instead of giving it its place clearly as a "portion of the one holy catholic Church," so far again *makes it take the attitude of difference, separation, and schism. Its effect is to make our Church refuse this great feature of living unity with the true Church of Christ.*

Now we may well ask whether in *this* respect the General Council has set forth the true basis upon which to place our Church in this land and this age, preparing it for its great mission and work in the future. Let it be here repeated, that no assertion of error is made against the Confession. We are distinctly assuming that it is our real confession, expressing our deepest convictions of the teaching of the inspired word. Still,

is it wise or right to put our Church on a basis so false in itself, and which separates it from the law and life belonging to the Church catholic? Even should it never, to the end of time, need to use the freedom of this principle of development, we would not have it renounce its *right* to share in its gains, nor antagonize itself to the clear law of the true Church's life and progress. A confessional basis, such as is sought by a particular Church, need not, of course, make any express provision for the action of the principle of development. But the wrong in this case is its distinct *exclusion*, and that this exclusion is put among "*fundamental principles.*" On the simple, yet erroneous assumption that no more light is *ever*, after the development wrought by the theologians of the Form of Concord in 1577, to break forth from the word of God, under the sanctified studies, experience, and divine guidance of the Church century after century, the framers of these "Principles" have undertaken to declare that the Lutheran Church must exempt itself from submission to this law, and divest itself of this characteristic or attribute of the true Church which is to progress in its mission "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God."* The exclusion is inserted in the face of the teaching of our own theologians, and in contradiction of the principle asserted by Luther himself both for his own guidance and for the guidance of the Church which he was providentially reforming and restoring to its right relation to the word of God.

But this is not all. To see the full teachings of the Fundamental Principles in these two aspects, they must be looked at not simply in their separate force, *but also in the bearing of their joint action.* It is in what their combination means, that we can best test their soundness as a proposed basis for our Church.

The divided and discordant state of the Church of Christ is certainly to be deplored. The mingling of human passion in the past controversies in which men have earnestly contended for the faith, has left its marks in separations and antagonisms intensified beyond the necessities of pure and loving fidelity to the truth. The Church's condition of broken fellowship is not

*Ep. 4 : 13. Revised Version.

only unseemly before the world, but a distinct failure in the divinely required 'meekness' in which believers are besought to "keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," Eph. 4 : 2. But the intolerant spirit of other times is disappearing. The conviction among the members of the great historic branches of the Protestant Church of their real oneness in Christ is growing into the further conviction that this oneness ought to be better manifested. The attraction of real brotherhood is felt. The dividing differences are beginning to be less in comparison with the grandeur of our "common faith" and "common salvation." It is felt that the reproach of the order of things must be wiped away which implies that after eighteen centuries believers have not yet reached a consensus as to what true Christianity *is*, sufficient for its own appointed fellowship. The "specific unities" are beginning to show sign of recognizing also the broader œcumenic unity. The calmer, more loving temper, unhindered by violent controversies, has contributed somewhat to this. The study of comparative symbolics, revealing the vast consensus of doctrine, has contributed something. The grand coöperative work of the evangelical Churches, united often in labors of reform, mercy and benevolence, in services of prayer and thanksgiving, bringing believers together where the common Christian heart is felt to be beating, has added its influence. But the very development of doctrine, at the roots of which the Council would lay its axe, has been helping the movement to both unity and union. Among the Reformed Churches the harsher edges of Calvinism are disappearing, and if they are not removed from their Confessions, they are being gradually modified in their systematic and applied theologies. Some Churches are modifying the bearings of their creeds by further defining explanations. Only in the last number of THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY there was an article exhibiting the approaches to Lutheran views of one of the most prominent teachers of a sister Church. It is just through these agencies of coöperative Christian work and closer Christian fellowship, and the outbreaking light from the word of God in the development of doctrine, that the greater unity in the faith is to come.

But the so-called Fundamental Principles on which the General Council asks the Lutheran Church to place itself, proposes to put all this under arrest. They break, or hold as broken, the fellowship between the "particular Churches." For, it is to be borne in mind, that it is not only the Lutheran Church that is to exclude the wider fellowship in pulpit and at altar. The principle of exclusivism in conscientious testimony against what is held to be erroneous views of the doctrines of the gospel, asserted for the Lutheran Church, being declared to be the rule "which accords with the word of God," is thus declared to be the true one also for the *other* "particular Churches."* Thus the setting up of exclusive altar against altar is to pass into fundamental principle for all, and complete the unhappy separations of the Christian Church. And here comes in the joint action of the second feature of the Council's law. This—the positive exclusion of confessional modification—asserted for the Lutheran Church, is also set forth as a general principle. It is affirmed as the law of identity of "a particular Church"—*every* particular Church—that it abide in its original confessional statement, in the native sense, as when the Church attained distinctive being and name. *No* Church is to have the right to grow toward unity with any other, or harmonize its Confession toward a common understanding of the word. *All* confessional development in all the component "parts" of the Church of Christ is excluded. None is possible by formal change of Confession—for to do so is to lose identity and forfeit name. None can come by indirection, through gradual, silent, unconfessed change of view by ministers and people—for the "members are to embrace from the heart and use the articles of faith" in the "original sense." Even in the Church catholic, all further development of *doctrine* is shut off, except by *fresh schisms and new sects.* The present "particular Churches" can teach, forever, only precisely as their Confessions now say—or die. Unity and union can come only by the dissolution of all the present Churches, *except one*—whose *present* Confession the Church of the future must accept in its native, original sense. And the united action of the two

*Dr. Krauth's Theses on the Galesburg Rule, 49, 60.

rules must thus mean, that the present broken fellowship of the Church, the existing separatistic communions, with pulpit testifying against pulpit, and altar antagonizing altar, disowning the œcumenical "communion of saints," must be made perpetual, or continued till, in the victory of *one* particular Church, the rest shall cease to exist. All this, because, according to the General Council, by the fundamental law of the existence of the particular Churches, they are solemnly mortgaged to isolated communion and unchangeable Confession.

Dr. Krauth has well said: "The New Testament idea does not tolerate 'particular Churches' in the sense of distinct and hostile denominations, separate communions, struggling for the same ground, Churches with clashing faiths."* Surely these "Fundamental Principles" which endeavor to have these "particular Churches' stand toward each other in unrecognizing attitude, testifying against each other in all the three ways of official expression in the case, by specific creed, by exclusion from pulpit and by exclusion from altar, and adopt a law of changeless permanency in these mutually repudiating forms of faith, represent the very perfection of sectarianism. It seems to us that the establishment of such principles would be the erection of the strongest possible barriers against the prayer of the Saviour: "That they may be one—that the world may know that Thou hast sent me." But that prayer has the force of a prophecy, which shall be fulfilled, and the prophecy, we are glad to believe, stands in the way of the real authentication of any such principles.

We are often told: "We are *Lutherans*—let us *be* Lutherans." Yes, certainly. But let us not mistake for Lutheranism anything merely incidental, perhaps an excrescence connected with its outward organization and practice from the antagonisms of the past, temporary and local, and not at all a part of its substantial faith and Christian life. And let us not renounce the great divine principle of practical amenability of creeds to the revising light of God's word, in and on which our Church legitimately came into distinctive being, in the unity and fellowship of the

*Theses, 86.

true universal Church of God. Let us not diminish our Church into a narrow, intolerant sect, into which others can come only by acceptance of extreme separatism. But let us make our Church what Luther and his co-reformers meant it to be, the revived, purified, true Church of Christ—into which the followers of Christ may come unhindered by any nececssity of restriction and sectarian spirit, unhindered, indeed, by anything but want of true, pure Christianity. In *this* conception and character, the Lutheran Church, with its most catholic of all the Protestant Confessions, may take the position and order of progress in which, as it is the delight of so many of us to represent it, its truly scriptural system of doctrine may stand for the coming consensus of the Christian faith, and attract and unite the dissentient elements of evangelical Christendom.

ERRATA.—On p. 524, 14th line, for "any" read *and.* On p. 525, 1st line, omit "in." On p. 534, 2nd line, for "used" read *use.*

ARTICLE V.

THE MISSION OF THE CHRISTIAN ARTIST.

By REV. ALLEN TRAVER, A. M., Rochester, N. Y.

I deem it sufficiently exact to say that by the term Christian I mean a rational being, who has in his unseen and thinking nature, spiritual convictions, spiritual affections, and spiritual aspirations, in the sense revealed in the New Testament, as that is expounded by accredited teachers.

By the word Artist, in connection with the one defined, I mean a man with a cunning hand, directed and moved to its essential tasks, with a fertile brain and propelled by the motives of a humanized and a spiritualized heart, in which the love of God dwells, as well as the love of man; and in which dwell faith, hope, charity; one who amid daily toils finds pleasure in the contemplation of the infinite, and who loves the true, the beautiful and the good.

In that very interesting and profitable book, "Ben-Hur; a tale of the Christ," Balthasar, the Egyptian, is represented as raising

his eyes most devoutly and reverently, and saying these words, which we regard as pure gold:

"There is a kingdom on the earth, though it is not of it—a kingdom of wider bounds than the earth—wider than the sea and the earth, though they were rolled together as finest gold and spread by the beating of hammers.

"Its existence is a fact as our hearts are facts; and we journey through it from birth to death without seeing it; nor shall any man see it until he hath first known his own soul; for the kingdom is not for him, but for his soul. And in its dominion there is glory such as hath not entered imagination—original, incomparable, impossible of increase."

This kingdom is wider than any that the sun in his meridian splendor ever shone upon. It is one of Principle and of Truth, rather than of a material nature and form. There are a few principles, or essential truths, entering into this empire, which are radical and are the subject of more or less discussion in all lands on which the sun shines or are watered by the dews from heaven. These are the doctrine of a soul in every human body; the alienation of that soul from the Being who made it; and the immortality of that soul, in good or evil. On the other side, there is the doctrine of one God; that he is infinitely holy, pure and just, and that the Christ is the only mediator between God and man. All who are members of this spiritual kingdom in spirit and in life, and are seeking in some or many ways to advance its interests and secure its reception in our natures, may be designated most truthfully as Christian Artists.

In analyzing this subject, that we may see its beautiful order and glory, and that we may learn to think God's thoughts after him, we find a number of elements that enter into every achievement of an artistic nature.

I. God is the grand, original, creative artist.

II. Man is a secondary artist, forming conceptions and ideals more or less in harmony with the divine ideals after which he should work.

III. The materials on which the Christian artist works.

IV. The arrangement, the method or the order, and the plan of work.

We call the works of God, created by his infinite power and sustained by his goodness, nature. Nature is the thought of God in crystallized forms. Every created object that is beautiful, true, and good, was made after an idea or an ideal, and a thought in the divine mind. Symbols of future perfection and splendor are in these ideas. God is the author of all truth, beauty, and goodness. He reveals goodness through the promptings of the conscience; truth to the intellect, and beauty to the aesthetic nature. And as a man becomes a saint in proportion as he receives the revelation of moral and religious truth, which purifies his motives, changes his unholy and carnal disposition to the love of God and the good, and renders his conscience keenly alive and active, and causes him in a measure to illustrate, in his life, the life of the perfect man; as he becomes a philosopher in the measure in which he receives truth in the intellect and reason, and produces it on a larger scale, from new combinations; and uses it in unfolding the orders and systems that are in nature, and only partially revealed; so also he becomes a poet, composer, or architect, sculptor, musician or painter, in the proportion in which he receives the revelation of beauty in his aesthetic nature, allows it to be flooded with beauty;—beauty which may be defined as the smile of all that God has made; and as we find it reproduced in works of art. The ideal, the archetypes in the divine mind, the intellectual, the moral, and the spiritual; the poetic conceptions and elements; the roots and germs of the reason, if these are not found, we only deal with the material, and the outward forms; and fail to reach the essential basis; the vital force which pervades and animates the material.

More than this, there is an ideal found in man's religious history. There is a divine pattern revealed along the line of human history. We cannot pursue the nature, or the mode of the life of the Supreme Being. But we can observe and learn many things, which he has created, as we unfold their nature and use them in the affairs of life in the exercise of our reasoning nature. Christian artists are the priests of nature, man, and God. And there is not an inch on earth's broad domain, where there are

not thoughts from God, constituting that point a shrine for man's worship and priestly offerings.

God reveals himself in the true, the beautiful and the good. We learn to feed our souls from these exquisite revelations of himself.

We are the spectators and admirers of an ever-changing and marvelous universe which is filled with living charms and with new suprises every hour of life.

> They twinkle in the stars—
> They flash in the sunshine and load the summer air.

The strength and the power of man, the grace and the beauty of woman, are in this material sanctuary, nature. The architect copies the forms of tree and mountain and cave in his arches, turrets and spires. He spreads on canvas the colors of the sunset and sunrise, Autumn and Spring, Summer and Winter. He cuts into the marble the beauty of the human form, after studying it as an ideal, as it was created by divine power.

But God is manifest in matter, flesh and spirit. He creates, disposes, and groups forms, colors. The charms of this beautiful earth, sky and water is the result of harmonizing all these elements. He created all the departments that exist for reproduction, combination and harmony. But his love, his goodness, his holiness, and his righteousness and truth, soar beyond all things seen and temporal, and constitute the everlasting beauty in the perfect man, Christ. In the evening hour, when the sun descends below the horizon, and his mellow rays are thrown back from fleecy clouds, which hang in folds and reefs along the western sky, tinged with golden hues, so rich and so variegated, a pious heart may innocently contemplate it as imaging forth to earthly expectants the drapery of those mansions of the heavenly temple, which are intended and prepared for the redeemed.

All the works of God, this vast universe of worlds, are made after the thoughts, the ideas, and the ideals found in the divine mind. On this same principle, the artist makes a painting or a piece of statuary after the idea and the picture in his mind. The works of God are made after his pure, clear and serene thoughts, or perfect ideals. We see the works of the infinite

artist in the crystallization of a rock, and in the vast revolutions of a world that rolls in space. The glory of God as a creative artist is made known in his works, and his works are patterns of his thoughts and ideas. By the use of the telescope, the eye penetrates to distant worlds, gathers truth from imperial distances which seemingly belong to God alone. In the use of the microscope, we reveal hitherto unseen realms of life and beauty, unknown forms of being, in earth, air and water, and in the food we eat.

A certain portion of God's created works are infinitely great, and fearfully exact in modes. Another portion are infinitely little in form and size, far below the natural sight to behold. The power of the infinite is seen in the care he exercises over the infinitely great and the elegantly little.

The serenely beautiful and majestic works of God are only the shadows in concrete forms, of the thoughts of the divine mind. As in the beauty of the wild wood flower, we see the beauty and grandeur of his creative nature, partially reflected, so in the hills and the mountains and in the surging of the boundless ocean, we see hints of his infinity.

We observe the marvelous works of God. We think about them, and find law and order all through them. We find part joined to part, and when we consider them in our narrow and limited way, we go through the process, and we learn to think God's thoughts after him.

God may have had many original plans. From these he selected the one plan and order which now exists in peerless beauty. The present moral system was before him as an ideal, and then he gave it a real and material form. He created all truth; all beauty; all goodness. He created angels and men. He has given us a wide margin in which to exercise our powers and use our freedom. We are indeed hemmed in by the bounds of time and space, and on these broad theatres of action we conceive plans; we form the order for our lives; we execute for our pleasure and profit and for the elevation of our moral, intellectual and spiritual nature, and for the advancement of truth and righteousness in the world.

There is not a moment of time in which the divine energy

does not operate in sustaining and keeping the universe of mind and matter in orderly and harmonious action. And as disciples of Christ, we are to be workers with God, as he was, in that we read, John 5 : 17, my Father worketh and I work.

II. Man is a secondary artist.

Taught in the school of nature, providence and revelation, man becomes a worker in the wide field of nature, now so wasted by sin and shorn of beauty.

The germs of an artistic life are found in every rational soul. He who with the force of natural genius pierces the inner secrets of nature and embraces within his eagle glance the wide horizon of her glory, and who, having enjoyed the seer's privilege, can paint, or in some form delineate his vision for the benefit of others, so that they can read the deeply pictured page—he is a human, creative artist, and a priest of nature and art. He who reposes on the lap of mother earth and at her veiled bosom worships, or gathers a single flower, and with it illustrates the truth and beauty and goodness of God, as seen in nature, is one of this order.

We take this material, moral and spiritual universe just as it is, and would not find fault with the works of the Great Creator. And we are to put forth our calm might and do our part in creating fine spiritual, artistic forms, out of what was once fallen, sinful natures. We can mould them into new forms of beauty, as the artist takes the Parian marble and moulds and forms it after ideas that are in his own mind.

Copying nature, the works of God, and thus conceiving or executing some new design, we call it art. The epithet poet, or creator, is as ancient as art itself and is one of the primary, philosophical conceptions of the Greek mind. As applied to God, the Supreme Cause, we cannot comprehend it. It is far beyond the reach of man's longest line of thought, and is rooted in eternity.

> "Eternity! a truth that 's not conceived,
> By feeble human mind it is believed;
> He takes the truth that revelation gives
> And by his faith it is the Christian lives."

And as we are allied to the spirit of the ideal man, and the

truth, beauty and goodness which He reveals, and reproduce it in the minds and hearts of men, do we resemble the Divine Artist.

An artist is one who does good work of a certain kind. He puts things in a telling form; they stay put; and they keep telling.

He works with the body after the ideas and plans of the soul. He has an animating principle within; and he gives an outward and sensible form. An artist is one who gives expression by the hand or the voice, for the eye or the ear, "whether in space as the arts of design, or in time as the vocal arts, or in both space and time, as the drama or the landscape gardening, which imply mass and motion in space and time."

The origin and the idea of art, and the mission of the Christian artist is in God. And in all his works there is the tendency to create beauty, unfold truth, and promote goodness.

The good and the worth of art in nature is under man, and both from God. You look on the inanimate forms of art and design, the marvelous creations of human genius, with much pleasure. You consider those creations designated the Fine Arts, as architecture, sculpture, painting, poetry and music, and prose literature.

You see what cannot possibly exist on lifeless canvas, or in the cold and dead marble form, or in the cloud capped temple or gorgeous cathedral—namely the thoughts, the ideas, ideals, and the purest spiritual conceptions which were the patterns and ensamples after which the creations were formed.

Thus also when you look on the grand and the beautiful works of our heavenly father, you see back of them and at their root the ideas of the divine mind; the forms of things unseen, unheard and untouched. Socrates, the wisest and the best of men, but once one of the most corrupt, was like his father, in early life, a sculptor. At the age of thirty-five he threw aside his graver's tools, and instead of turning Parian marble into the similitude of men, engaged in the elevated and heavenly calling of turning men into the similitude of God, or of the divine image. When he abandoned mallet and pick for the teacher's

chair this ancient worthy became an artist in a more exalted sense than before.

The essential difference in his vocation was that while he had been dealing with insensate materials from the marble quarry, he was now dealing with the lives, the minds, souls of living men. His aim and work had been to fashion into forms of beauty and speechless grandeur the perishable stone, while now it is the passion of his life to fashion into some of the forms of truth or duty the thinking principle, the immortal mind. Judged by whatever standard, it must be admitted, that the highest art is that which consisteth, not so much in giving coloring, however brilliant, or form, however graceful or exquisite, to animate any perishable form, as in quickening dead souls, in advancing human character, in shaping human beings after the pattern, or into the likeness of Jesus Christ.

And what indeed can well be nobler than this art which has for its object the building, not of cathedrals, but of manhood; the restoration of the defaced and fallen architecture of the human soul; and the training again of something beautiful to see, and grateful to the soul, around the crumbling altars and broken arches of the desolate temple of the human heart.

In our sacred books there is revealed an ideal, a divine pattern; and during many centuries of man's religious history, this has been studied. The perfect archetype is revealed in four evangelists. Having passed into the heavens, the moral image of Jesus, if regarded as nothing more than an idea, is the noblest and dearest heritage of humanity.

This ideal is before us as a pattern and it will not grow dim, neither have we yet found their equal excellence among men. And the longer we contemplate this matchless one, the more do we realize that he is the chief among ten thousand, and how poor we are in humanity and love and refined purity. But he is painted in such colors that it is impossible to contemplate the picture without its irresistibly affecting the heart.

During the existence of man on the earth, God has brooded lovingly over the earth and man. While the natural world of sight and sound has been full of change God has been steady in the administration of goodness. And we become secondary

artists when we enter into the deep sympathies of his great nature, in his plans, ways and efforts and works and thoughts, to restore men, though we may not be as perfect as the master.

It is the glory of a human soul to employ time and strength, in this exalted pursuit—in this life and action in which God is engaged.

God creates life. He is its author, preserver and benefactor. Man is a co-worker with God, when he carries onward the grand plans and ways of the creator, in subduing and using nature and also in moulding into fine spiritual forms the souls, the entire nature of men. We may be sure that God has in his heart an image and a thought of each one of us. And so poor is our realization of this thought, ideal and image, that were we to see it, we would be humbled and put to shame. We have dim conceptions of what we should be.

III. The materials on which the Christian artist works.

These are men, women, children. These are individuals, personalities, beings marked with rational life and spiritual activity. The secondary artist works on beings of his own nature, with souls, the deathless mind, spiritual in essence, and endless in duration.

How small the word; how numerous the beings it represents; and how potent the meaning; how vast its destiny.

> "What a piece of work is man.
> How noble in reason.
> How infinite in faculties.
> In form and moving how express and admirable.
> In action how like an angel.
> In apprehension how like a God.
> The beauty of the world.
> The paragon of animals."

"What a concentration of energies; what a gathering up of solemn thoughts; what a home of dear and gentle affections; what a fountain of tears and sorrows are found in this spiritual enclosure."

What fearful powers sleep within its folds, and how it surges within, like a seething volcano. How the human bosom swells with grief, and the eye flashes with passion. What images of the grand, drawn from nature, gleams of what at times seems

godlike and destined to be eternal, lie hidden in its unfathomable depths.

Endowed with powers to commune with nature, man and the infinite, a reflection of the brightness of heaven, a mirror that collects and concentrates within itself all the moral splendors of the universe, a light kindled in the skies, designed to brighten in splendor while eternity endures—this is the grand, great, peerless material on which the Christian artist works.

And yet, this mind is in ruins. There are through its apartments evidences of beauty and power—here and there a noble pillar, now and then a well turned arch indicating the beauty of the original structure.

The fearful work and devastation of sin, and the ugly work of the destroyer are around us. And human forms and agencies, vitiated by sin, have marred and ruined much of the good, the true, and the beautiful, along the march of the ages.

Still, the beautiful and true and good, in word and thought and deed are immortal and enduring. It is a delightful experience to call up in memory the forms, and the faces, and the sparkling eyes, and the cheerful, friendly smile of those who were our teachers in the past. The truths and thoughts they communicated, were glorious to our young and forming minds, and more than this, are immortal. Communicated to us by human agents, have we done our share to vivify the life of humanity in individuals?

And we realize the hope, that the magnificent thoughts and doctrines uttered by Jesus, and by Paul, and by uninspired Miltons, and others, men of like passions and infirmities, will live as long as mankind endures, while a sand remains in the hour glass of time, or the pillars of the world remain unshaken. And the beauty and the grandeur of the thoughts, and deeds of the truthful, the wise, and the good of all ages, have grown out of the working and combinations of the germs of thought and deeds and eternal laws shaped, expressed and executed by the infinite. The human, creative artist, taking up these divine thoughts, elaborating and combining them anew, has given them a victorious propagation among men, and along the line of the centuries and the ages.

And while there are thoughts, there are also forms, flowers, vine-clad hills, golden harvests, vineyards and tangled glades, and majestic forests. Crags are covered with verdure. Fields are aglow with lilies. Flowers smile from Alpine summits. Pluck a flower and ask who made it. Consider its beauty, variety, and completeness and adaptation to man as a means of culture. Clearly it convinces us that reason and taste are involved in the wayside flowers that we may be instructed.

It is not the purpose of a Christian artist, or one who considers the mission of the artist, to explain the mystery of the universe. He may attempt to find the key to a higher harmony than exists, but in this he finds much that indicates discord, and a schism in man. This is a fallen world. We are in some sense in ruins. The earth is arched over with graves, and the earth itself indicates that it was made for fallen beings.

The thorn and the thistle are here, and in this briery world we find much in a physical, intellectual and moral and spiritual sense that bristles with spiny ferocity, while untold horrors are on every side during the longest periods in human history. If there is not moral ruin, why is the earth sterile? Why does the sirocco blow, and why does the angry ocean devour fleets laden with the means of human comfort and human happiness?

The race that exists on this planet is a turbulent one; and more than this, it is averse to the authority of the one who made it. Men by nature do not like to submit to the authority of God and walk in his ways. Man, the human soul, is vitiated by sin. Each and every one of our spiritual powers is defiled by sin.

There is a want of harmony of the parts. Our nature remains human nature, but it is fallen, and our disposition is averse to the thoughts, the plans and the ways of God.

Christ, the original Christian artist, came on earth the ideal man, for the purpose of restoring man. He came clothed with absolute perfections. He has all the germs of truth and purity. He has a plan, and ways for the restoration of men, through reconciliation with God. And men are co-workers with God. Our nature, disposition, and ways and character are to sin; this is the drift of the soul, the image of the evil heart. Hence, our history is a tragic one.

The Christian artist begins his work with his human subject, armed with objections against the authority of God, and with aversion to the golden rule, and with an inclination to make life easy. We look at nature, wreathed with smiles. We look at the useful, and find toil is quite essential to supply our daily wants. We are pleased with improvements which render placid and comfortable our lives. And in time we are pleased, profited, and admire the results of the fine arts. We are doomed to toil, and it is for our good. We are invited to consider our soul's needs. The religion of Christ requires of us a thankful acceptance, and cheerful obedience. In adjusting ourselves to nature, man and God, we do not experience the yoke burdensome, when submissive.

The work of the Christian artist, softens while it reflects the truth, the beauty and the goodness of God.

The angular form of man, and the rude but useful creations of the mechanic, are not seemly to those who have a fine and a delicate taste, and the imagination hints the propriety of clothing it with flowing robes, and waving and spiral lines of beauty. When we make a translation from another language, we fail in an artistic sense, if we make it too literal and bald. Hence we learn to add to it the graces of a fine, but chastened rhetoric.

We do not like nature, man, or literature too literal. Hence, the imagination clothes life with the drapery and the splendor of its creations; and the archetypal ideas of the reason are made mellow with tints and tones drawn from nature's laboratory.

IV. The method, and the plan of this Christian, artistic work.

Many fine and good illustrations from the life of individuals, reveal to us how they were educated, and the order in their lives. We are all interested in the unfoldings of the individuality, the gatherings into the personality; and the doings of men in life.

Gray's Elegy in a Country Church Yard contains more beautiful figures and illustrations drawn from nature, and from human life, than any poem of the same length in the English language. It has also done much to create in men a disposition to consider the past and to reflect on the present and raise questions of the future. The transient affairs of this life loom up before every

reader, and there are hints of other truths which lead to consider our motives, choices, plans, and ways. Turning aside from the highway, in the winter season into an unused and almost obliterated cemetery, and deciphering the inscriptions on the moss-covered head-stones, I began to reason from facts contained on two.

From the dates, I found I was about three years of age when one man died, and I have a vivid recollection of a number of things at the funeral, and of the man once making me a present when he was well.

Two years after this the other man died, as the date showed me, and I recollect that as I wished to go to a rise of ground and see the funeral procession, I learned to tell the time on the dial-plate of the clock, that I might go at the time the procession would appear in the line of vision. Going forth at the designated time there rested before my eyes the cemetery, where the rude forefathers and foremothers of the region sleep; and stretching away in the distance that imperial panorama, the valley of the Hudson, earth, sky, water; woodland and cultivated field; the Katskills, where the woodman cut the hemlock on the mountain; the valley where the hunter once chased the antelope, or threw the lasso on the plain.

The old man of the mountains rested there defined against the western horizon, as if cut with a diamond, or arched into the blue heavens, (but I had not the eye of an Irving to see it). Counting the vehicles in the procession I had also the curious workings of thought concerning death, life and kindred subjects. In after years rambling over the hills, and in the woods of the mountain ranges, which extend from the grand white mountains on the north, and constitute the highlands of the Hudson, and extend far into the regions of the sunny South, and where day-dreams are in accordance with nature, I raised the question, what is this I? this soul that thinks; what is its destiny? Will all men die? Do they live forever? Thus have I shouted question after question into the Sybil cave of destiny, and received no answer but an echo; no audible voice, but a stimulating answer from nature, the human soul, and the pages of a well accredited revelation. Thus the soul opens to truth.

1st. There must be an open soul.

2d. Learning to fix the attention.

3d. Aspiration to measures upon earth.

4th. These will secure development.

5th. Growth of mind is along the same line far out in the measures of time, space, and number and more.

6th. Culture in the finest and largest sense.

7th. Fulness of life comes, as material prosperity arises from industry and other qualities found in the same order in life.

The golden age of some forms of the fine arts, as painting, statuary and architecture seems for the time to have vanished from the brain and hand of man. Poets and composers of music scarcely rival those now numbered with the dead. But the lustre and the glory of a few is now the heritage of many. A better age is upon us.

An age of elevating men and women, boys and girls into forms and ways of pure and imperishable beauty, and of imperial spiritual grandeur has dawned on our world. The art of the chisel may be lost in a measure, and the beauty hidden in the marble may elude the skill of the artist. The power of rendering the human face and form on canvas may fail of exhibiting its highest skill and artistic finish. But we have gained the power and mastery over finer materials than was ever wrought into form by Grecian or Italian artists.

The human soul has been moulded and formed into ideals of peerless beauty. The old masters carved Apollo Belvideres, Laocoons, and gods and goddesses of rare beauty. They painted altar pieces, and frescoes; and the marble could almost seem to speak, and the canvas blush a roseate hue. But in the school of the Perfect, the ideal artist, we have learned to lay the guiding, forming hand on human souls, candidates for eternal life, and to help them on their way in becoming priests and kings unto God.

It is the glory of the artist who painted the Sistine Madonna. We almost envy the power and skill of the man who painted the Last Supper; or who carved the reviled Christ; or Moses as taken from the floating cradle on the Nile.

But it is something on which we may feel a little humble pride, or pleasure, if from some shy, awkward girl, we have helped to develop and unfold and mature a Harriet Newell, or a Mary Lyon, or a Fidelia Fiske; and out of some shy boy, a Harlan Page, or an honest, and an inflexible and unflinchingly incorrupt judge; or a lawyer, who in halls wherein the wronged seek justice, is firm and reliable for integrity and principle; or the man of business who in the marts of labor and trade is faithful to religious conviction, and political duties and domestic and social life. We often have low thoughts, and we have the tendency to fall under their powers, as well as rise above them.

It is a noble work as the poet well says

> "To send the Doric column to the skies:
> Pile towers on towers, and build up mausoleums
> To human vanity. * * *
> To make the marble speak, the canvas glow,
> The heart leap into eloquence, or trip
> To the light numbers of the poet's creed."

This may be grand and noble in its way, but it is nobler and grander to incite men to live for high actions, aims, and purposes, comporting with, and rendered noble and pure with truth; to awaken the slow, sluggish soul with new-born hopes; to create blissful feelings where souls were burdended with woe.

We may put forth efforts, and lead men to songs, more spontaneous than the statue of Memnon ever uttered, when the rays of the morning sun first touched his silent, and cold marble; or than a prima donna ever sung, and through the instruction in truth, send to weary and sad souls dreams of paradise, to visit pillows once made sorrowful with thorns of sin. "Is this not nobler, indeed, than to shape the semblance of divinest contour or feature on the cold, dead marble, or to sing the longest Iliad ever dreamed of?"

Teachers in every department and every grade are artists, and sculptors and painters, and musicians and poets.

"Into your hand hath been committed material more precious by far than all the marbles of Carrara or Pentiticus. Yours is the rare privilege of tracing on the imperial cope of memory forms of beauty that shall outlast, by eternal ages, all the frescoes of a Raphael. Be faithful to your high trust. Grow not weary in well-doing."

ARTICLE VI.

THE TEMPERANCE QUESTION AS AN ECONOMIC ISSUE,

OR THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC IN ITS RELATION TO THE FARMER, THE LABORER, THE MERCHANT AND TO SOCIETY.

By Rev. Samuel Schwarm, A. M., Tiffin, O.

The temperance question is not merely a moral question, but it is, first of all, an economic question. Those engaged in the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors claim that theirs is a legitimate and important industry; that owing to the very large amount of capital invested (estimated at a billion of dollars, with an annual income of nine hundred millions) and the many men employed (estimated all told, in manufactures, wholesale, retail, etc., at five hundred and seventy-five thousand) that it is one of the principal industries of the country and conduces to the welfare of society. The brewers of the United States, in an essay distributed at the Centennial celebration in 1876, say: "The brewers are just as necessary to the common weal as the butcher, the baker, the tailor, the builder, or any other economic industry;" and they say further, "The trade, the business, and the calling of the brewer is just as much an integral part of a state as any other necessary calling, and without it something would be lacking for the general good." They claim, therefore, that the branch of industry which they represent, is entitled to demand from the national government, and from the several state legislatures, the same recognition and protection as any other. The distillers virtually make the same claims in behalf of their business. The Liquor Dealers' Association, composed of both brewers and distillers, scattered broadcast over the state of Ohio, a few days before the vote on the Second Amendment, a circular, in which they stated how much money they had invested in this industry in the state, how many men they employed, how many bushels of grain they used, how many horses they kept, and how many buildings they occupied, etc. They claimed that the passing of that amendment meant the destruction of that amount of money, the throwing out of employment

so many men, and out of use so many buildings, and out of a market so many bushels of grain and so many horses, etc. They tried to impress the people of the state, and especially the farmers, with the idea that theirs was one of the great and important industries of the state and that its destruction would be a public calamity.

Now the foregoing is undoubtedly the view of the liquor industry that those who are connected with it entertain of it. And it is not merely the idea of those who are connected with it, but it is also the idea of many who are not directly engaged in it. The farmer thinks that the destruction of the liquor industry would destroy a market for grain, the laborer thinks it would destroy a market for labor, the merchant thinks it would destroy a market for his articles of trade, and the capitalist thinks it would destroy an investment for his money; and hence they are not very zealous for its destruction, though they see that it has great evils following in its train. Are these parties right? Is the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors a profitable industry to the farmer, the laborer, the merchant, and to society in general? Does it really add to the happiness and welfare of society? Would its prohibition, or destruction, be a public calamity? Would the evils following its destruction be greater than those acknowledged to be connected with the industry? These are questions which a great many persons, if not a majority of persons in the United States, would answer in the affirmative. It will not do to merely say that these persons are insincere in their views concerning the liquor industry, and that they are governed by their appetites. Denunciations are not arguments, and denunciations will not change opinions. Many of those persons hold these opinions because they have never studied the subject. They do know that the liquor industry does furnish a market for a certain amount of produce, labor, etc., but they have never considered what, if any thing, would take the place of this market if this industry were destroyed. They have never taken the pains to compare the amount of the purchases, and the amount of the labor employed, by this industry, with that of other industries. Now we shall endeavor to answer these questions by making a comparison between this,

so-called, industry and some of the other industries of the country. And, I think, it will be conceded that the industry that employs the largest number of laborers, pays the most in wages, uses the most raw and prepared material, and manufactures the most useful and valuable products, is the most beneficial to the farmer, laborer, merchant, and to society in general, and that it deserves the greatest encouragement. Keeping this in view let us go to the tenth, and last, census of the United States and see whether the claims made in behalf of the liquor industry can be substantiated.

In 1880 there were three thousand one hundred and fifty-two (3152) places in the United States where liquors, distilled, malt and vinous, were manufactured. These manufactories had an invested capital of one hundred and eighteen million, twenty-seven thousand, seven hundred and twenty-nine ($118,027,729) dollars; they employed 33,698 persons; they paid in wages 15,078,574 dollars; they used material to the value of 85,921,374 dollars, and their manufactured products were estimated at 144,-291,241 dollars.

In the same year (1880) there were 20,313 places where agricultural implements, boots and shoes, including custom work and repairing, but not including rubber goods, were made. These establishments employed a capital of 118,657,333 dollars; they employed 178,218 persons; they paid in wages 67,711,736 dollars; they used material to the value of 154,073,915 dollars; and their manufactured products were worth 276,034,389 dollars.

By making a comparison we find that 118 millions of dollars employed in the manufacture of intoxicating liquors gave employment to 33,689 individuals. The same amount, almost, employed in the manufacture of agricultural implements, boots and shoes, etc., employed 178,218 individuals. One hundred and eighteen millions of dollars employed in the former paid to labor 15,027,579 dollars, in the latter it paid to labor 67,711,736 dollars. One hundred and eighteen millions of dollars employed in the former bought of the farmers and other producers of this country material to the value of 85,921,374 dollars; in the latter it bought of the farmers and other producers material to the value of 154,073,915 dollars. So 118 millions employed in the

manufacture of agricultural implements, boots and shoes, employed five and one third times as many individuals, it paid to labor four and one half times as much in wages, it bought of the farmers, etc., about twice as much material, and its manufactured products were worth twice as much money, as the same amount of capital invested in the manufacture of liquor. And besides, the former was distributed to 20,000 localities, while the latter was confined to 3,000 places, mostly large cities.

Now which is the more profitable industry? Tested in this way the liquor industry cannot stand a comparison with that of the manufacture of agricultural implements and boots and shoes. In the number of individuals employed, the amount of wages paid, the amount of material used, and the number of places benefited it falls far behind. But some one may say, You have made the most unfavorable comparison possible for the liquor industry. I do not believe that that is the case. I have taken these industries with which to compare it because the capital invested is nearly the same. But to satisfy the objector let us continue. If we take the products of all the mechanical industries of the country, the liquor industry included, we will find that nearly one fifth of their value has gone to the laborer, while taking the liquor industry alone we will find that only about one tenth has gone to the laborer; *i. e.*, the total products of all the manufactories of the country represent about twenty dollars out of every one hundred in labor, while the products of the liquor manufactory represent only about ten dollars out of every one hundred in labor. And now again, if we take the manufactories of the country as a whole, the liquor interest included (if it were excluded the ratio would be still higher) we will find that for every 1019 dollars of capital invested they employ one laborer, while we will find, if we take the liquor manufactories alone, that they employ only one laborer to every 5,580 dollars of capital invested. So we find that the manufactories of the country as a whole pay out of their products twice as much to the laborer, and employ five times as many individuals, as the same amount of capital does when invested in the manufacture of liquor. So this boasted industry does not do one half as well for the laborer, etc., as even the average industry of the country

does. This alone ought to be sufficient to condemn it in the judgment of those who have produce or labor to sell. But this is not all. Let us see if we cannot find out what proportion of the amount that the consumer pays for these different manufactured products goes to the laborer. There is a much larger increase in the price of the manufactured products of the liquor industry from the time they leave the factory and by the time they get into the hands of the consumer, than there is in the products of industries in general. Twenty-five per cent. is supposed to be a sufficient allowance for the increase of price of the products of industries in general from the time they leave the factory until they get into the hands of the consumer. But the increase of price of the products of the liquor manufactories, as they pass from the factories to the consumer, is from one hundred to five hundred per cent. It has been estimated that the liquors, for which the manufacturers in 1880 realized 144,000,000 of dollars, cost the consumers 700,000,000 of dollars, *i. e.*, counting 40 per cent. as the test of alcohol in retail spirits, and estimating the retail price of domestic spirits at six dollars per gallon, and of domestic beer and ale at twenty dollars per barrel. (This does not represent the whole liquor bill of the United States for 1880, but merely the bill for the home made article). Now what part of every one hundred dollars out of this 700,000,000 dollars went into the pockets of the laborers of this country? Why just about two dollars! And what part of every one hundred dollars of the retail price of manufactured products in general went into the pockets of the laborers of this country? Fourteen dollars, or just seven times as much! If the 700,000,000 dollars had been spent in miscellaneous industries instead of paying 15,000,000 dollars to labor it would have paid 105,000,000, which would have been a clear gain of 90,000,000 of dollars. But some of the various industries pay a much better per cent. to labor than the average, for example, for every one hundred dollars paid for hardware or furniture in 1880 twenty-four dollars went to labor to produce it, and for every one hundred paid for boots and shoes twenty dollars went to labor. Thus if the 700,000,000 dollars had been spent in industries as profitable to labor as hardware and furniture, instead of

the 15,000,000 which the laborer did get he would have gotten 180,000,000, or a clear gain of 165,000,000. The 700,000,000 spent for liquors in 1880 gave to the producers 7,500,000 days work at two dollars per day. If it had been spent for the products of manufactories in general it would have given them 52,500,000 days work at the same price, or seven times more, or if it had been spent for products of manufacture as profitable to the laborer as hardware and furniture, it would have given them 90,000,000 days work, or twelve times as much as it actually did. Or to put it in another light, if it had been used in promiscuous manufacturing, instead of giving employment to 33,689 persons, it would have given employment to 235,823; or if spent in the more laborious industries it would have given employment to 404,268 individuals.

There has been of late years a great hue and cry about "hard times" because of the scarcity of labor. Idle laborers make poor customers for the farmer, the merchant, the miller, etc. The wages of the producer are the purchasing power of the nation. If the producer has no work, he earns nothing and, consequently, buys nothing, or else buys on credit. This is what, to a certain extent, has caused the hard times of late years. Plenty of profitable labor is what is needed. How shall it be gotten? If this great amount of capital that was expended for the product of the distillery, the brewery and the wine press had been expended in the manufacture of the more profitable products it would have given constant employment to more than 300,000 more persons than it did. And besides it would have made use of more than 485,000,000 dollars worth of material instead of 85,000,000. The production of this material would have given employment, even at 600 dollars per year, to 808,000 more laborers. Thus the proper employment of this 700,000,000 of dollars would have given constant work to over one million men. This estimate is not too high, it is below instead of above the real figures; for 948,000,000 dollars paid out in wages by all the manufactories of the country in 1880 gave employment to 2,700,000 persons, at this rate the 700,000,000 would have given employment to nearly two millions. The 195,000,000 of dollars paid in wages by our railways in 1880 gave employment

to 419,000 men, even at this rate the 700,000,000 would have given employment to more than 1,520,000 men instead of to less than 200,000. Now these figures may be a little dry, but nevertheless it would pay the laboring and business men of this country to nibble at them occasionally. They would be more apt to bite into the real cause of hard times than by nibbling away at the old food—tariff, free trade, over-production, Republican and Democratic crookedness, etc., etc., which the politicians set up to them.

We have examined this so-called great industry in regard to work provided, wages paid, materials used, etc., let us now examine it in regard to the value and benefit of its products, and see whether it can make a better showing. Some articles are so beneficial to society that they must be manufactured though at great expense. How is it in regard to the products of the still, the brewery and the wine press? In order that any individual may not be a burden to society, or the country, he must return, at least, an equivalent for what he receives. It will not answer for him to receive valuable goods and return such as are of no real value. That is no better, if as good, as to return nothing. Political economy teaches us that "every individual who is not producing valuable goods, or adding by his labor to the welfare of the community in some form, at least to the amount which he receives, is a burden to society." It divides society into two classes, and only two; producers and non-producers. If a person does not produce, or help produce, anything of real value to society he is a burden, and is supported either as a worthy object of charity or is merely tolerated as an unavoidable nuisance. This latter is the case of the tramp, of the thief, and of the criminal classes. They, leech like, suck the life blood of the community and return nothing of value. Now what is true of individuals is also true of organized industries, for they are merely the association of individuals for the manufacture of various articles. Now if any, so called, industry fails to render to society useful products, at least to the extent it receives from the community, it becomes a burden. A farmer goes to a manufacturing establishment and buys a harvester.

It proves itself to be utterly worthless. That farmer has been injured, at least to the amount the machine cost him in money and in valuable time. Such manufactories are a detriment to a community, at least to the extent to which they succeed in selling such machines. Now, keeping this law of equivalents in mind, let us test some of the different industries of the land. If the liquor business is a great industry it can stand the test as well as any other and it need not shirk it. Let us begin with the farmer, for all will admit that the farming industry is a great, if not the greatest industry of our country. The farmer receives money from the community. What does he give it in return for that money? He gives it wheat, corn, oats, hay, horses, cattle, hogs, sheep, butter, eggs, etc., etc., things without which no community could possibly exist. Hence the farmer is looked upon as an absolute necessity. The prosperity of the farmer means the comfort and welfare of the entire community.

We next take the mechanic, for next to the farm stands the work or machine shop. The mechanic receives money from the society. What does he give it in return? Houses and their furniture, plows, wagons, reapers, threshers, railroads and their equipments, and so on indefinitely. It would be impossible for any community to make much progress without the labor and the skill of the mechanic. No man is able to provide for all of his wants unaided and make much progress. He can make much more effective use of his time by confining himself to some special calling and by exchanging his products in that line with men working in other callings for such things as he may need or desire. No one, possessing good judgment, will question the statement that the mechanic is a useful and indispensable member of society. And by mechanic I do not mean merely those who labor with machinery or on machines, but also those who live by useful hand labor.

We might next call up the merchant as a representative of the great commercial industry. The merchant is not a direct producer. He is, at best, an indirect or assistant producer. And hence it is the more necessary that he be required to give an account of the money he receives. He receives a great deal of money from the community. What does he give it in return

for that he receives? It is necessary for the prosperity of the farmer that he be enabled to get clothes, utensils, machinery, etc.; and it is equally necessary to the welfare of the laborer and the mechanic that they get the articles produced by the farmer. But these men have not time to make a success of their business, or calling, and yet hunt each other up to make all of these different exchanges. The merchant, therefore, to facilitate matters gathers up their various products and they come to him and make their exchanges. Thus they are saved a great deal of time and can afford to pay the merchant something, in the line of profit, for his trouble. The merchant is a time saver for the producers and thus he increases their power of production and becomes a very useful member of the community.

And in this way we might continue and call up the teacher, the preacher, the doctor, etc., each of which probably would be able to show satisfactorily that he added to the welfare and happiness of society. But let us now call up the representative of the liquor industry, which is claimed to be a great industry. Those he represents receive, as we have seen, great sums of money from the community. What do they give it in return? He replies, We give it fine liquors—wines, whiskies, ales, etc. These add much to the welfare of society. Suppose he were to make such an answer, and probably he would, any boy ten years old would know that facts are against him. Any little boy of ten years of age has witnessed enough to know that liquor adds nothing to the welfare and happiness of a community. But we say to the representative of the liquor interest, You are not honest, you are not sincere. Now answer truthfully, Is the man who has used your liquors for one, or five, or ten years any better off than he would have been had he never used them? Has his power to produce valuable products been increased? Has not this power to a certain extent, at least, been destroyed? He in reply admits that liquor makes some men stagger and roll into the gutter, that it makes some quarrelsome and fiendish, that it leads others to rob their wives and little ones of the very necessaries of life. He even admits that many of the crimes that are perpetrated in society have their origin in liquor. But he strenuously maintains that this is the outcome of an abuse

and not the results of a legitimate use. It is a hard thing against the liquor interest that its products are so liable to be abused. Who ever heard of a man going away from a butcher shop, or a dry goods store, or a Sunday school, or a church, to beat his wife and children and to quarrel with his neighbors? But let us call up one of the men who have used these liquors for a long time and has not made, what the liquor dealer calls, an abuse of them, but has used them moderately. We say to him, You have been drinking this man's liquors for years, you have been giving him a good part of your earnings, what have they done for you? Have they made you healthier, wealthier or wiser? The best he dare say, if he is honest, is that he does not know that they have done him any harm. There are many moderate drinkers who will claim this, but there are not many who will claim that they are better off, while there are many of them who will freely admit that they would be much better off if they had never tasted intoxicating liquors. There are many of them who will freely admit that the money spent for these liquors is worse than wasted, and that they are sorry that they ever formed the habit of drinking. And there is no doubt but what their friends and families are sorry too. If this be the case with the moderate drinker, what must it not be with the habitual drunkard.

But let us give the liquor interest another chance. We cannot afford to be unfair, nor do we need to be. It is claimed that this is one of the great and important industries of the country, that it is just as necessary to the welfare of the state as any other industry. Now let the liquor representative stand his customers along by the side of those who claim that liquors are not necessary and have, consequently, never used them, and there are plenty such with which to make the comparison, and let him show wherein they are better. I seem to see the line forming before me. At the one end are the Teetotalers and their families, at the other end are the drinkers and their families. At which end do you suppose one would find the puffed face, the bleared eye, the marks of shame and disease, the marks of sorrow and awful suffering on the faces of innocent women and children, the marks of infamy and crime, the gambler and the

thief, the jail bird and the thug? Every one knows what the awful contrast would be. The liquor industry could not be hired to enter such an exhibition. They are glad when their finished work gets into the alms houses, jails, etc., and away from the notice of the public.

This so-called great industry is taking immense sums of money from the people of this country every year. The yearly drink bill of this country is now generally estimated at 900,000,000 of dollars. Mr. Powderly has lately told us that the class of people who are commonly known as laborers spend 400,000,000 of dollars annually for liquors. What have they to show for it? Has it eased up the hard times for them? Are their families better fed, better clothed, more comfortable and intelligent because of this great outlay? Are our merchants any better because of this *great* industry? Are the patrons of the liquor interests their best customers? Is it not true that if a farmer or laborer, who is addicted to the use of liquors, comes into a town with one dollar in his pocket, that he will spend that dollar for drink and then ask the merchant to trust him for the necessaries of life? Is it not true that many men spend the money in the saloon that ought to be spent for food, for clothing, for furniture, for home adornments, and leave their families and homes without these blessings; and that the legitimate merchant loses this trade just because of the liquor industry? But we are told that the liquor dealer buys these things. But he is merely one where his patrons are a hundred. Where the merchant sells him one suit of clothes he misses the sale of a hundred suits to his patrons. Where the merchant sells him one book or picture he misses the sale of a hundred books and pictures to his customers.

What relation then does the liquor industry sustain to other industries and to society in general? In order not to be a burden on the community we have shown that it must at least return an equivalent for what it receives. But we have shown that this industry does not return any thing of real value for the immense sums it receives. Is it any better, therefore, and does it deserve to be ranked higher, than the pauper, the tramp, the thief, and the criminal classes? Is it not a veritable leech suck-

ing the life blood of the community and returning nothing but poison? Is not the liquor traffic on our body politic just what the lice and scab, etc., are on the bodies of animals? Is it not what the fly and chinch bug and weevil and rust, etc., are to our growing crops? It is all these and a great deal more as we will find later. I know that there are persons who contend that there is nourishment in these liquors, especially in beer, and that, consequently, the money spent for them is not a total loss. But facts and science are against them. One of the foremost of German chemists has said that he could demonstrate mathematically that a man could take as much nourishment on the point of a knife blade by dipping it into a sack of flour as there is in two gallons of beer, and that if a man were to drink two gallons of beer per day for a year, he would get just about as much nourishment out of it as there is in three pounds of beef steak. Now who would want to drink 730 gallons of beer in order to catch a loaf of bread or three pounds of steak, or who would want to pay in addition four hundred and seventy-five dollars for it. (It is not for the nourishment that is in them that these liquors are bought and drunk). The 900,000,000 of dollars spent per year in this country for these liquors are a total loss. They are just as much a loss as they would be were they destroyed by fire, or by flood, or by famine, or by foreign invasion. It would be better for the government to pay every one of the 575,000 persons engaged in this liquor industry one thousand dollars per year to get them to quit the business. The people of this country would save 325,000,000 of dollars by such a transaction.

But 900,000,000 of dollars annually is not the total waste caused by the liquor industry. To this we can add the loss of the productive labor of 575,000 men. This at six hundred dollars per year is 345,000,000 of dollars. And to this we can add the loss of at least half of the labor of 800,000 drunkards. This is not a high estimate of the number of drunkards. The lowest estimate places the number of saloons at 200,000. Now count four drunkards to each saloon and we have an army of 800,000. The loss of half of their labor at six hundred dollars per year is 240,000,000 of dollars. Now suppose that each of

these saloons has ten hard drinkers and we have an army of two millions of hard drinkers. Now suppose that their power to produce valuable articles and to occupy responsible positions is injured to the extent of one hundred dollars each per year, and we have 200,000,000 more to add to the above amounts. And then it is estimated that from one third to one half of the sickness of civilized nations is caused by intoxicating drinks. The death rate among moderate drinkers even has been found by the United Kingdom (British) insurance company, in an experience of fifty years, to be thirty-three per cent. greater than among teetotalers. It has been estimated that in New York City there is one case of alcoholic sickness to every one hundred and forty-five of the population. Of course in the country districts the ratio is not near so large. But suppose there is one case of sickness caused by liquor to every three hundred of the population of this country, and we have 166,666 persons simultaneously sick. Now count their medical attendance and expense at one dollar per day, and we have 60,000,000 dollars for doctor bills and expense in sickness, and count the loss of labor at one dollar per day and we have 60,000,000 more. Now count the cost of the support of 84,000 defective persons, such as insane, idiots, imbeciles, etc., made so through strong drink, at two hundred dollars per year and we have 17,000,000 of dollars. Add the cost of supporting 59,000 paupers, made such by drink, at one hundred per year, and we have 6,000,000 dollars. To this add the loss of the labor of these 59,000 paupers at three hundred per year and we have about 18,000,000 more. And now add the cost of supporting 39,000 prisoners at one hundred dollars per year and the loss of their labor at three hundred each per year and we have more than 15,000,000. We might add the cost of extra police, of prosecutions, of courts, of jails, of alms houses, of insane asylums. These alone would amount to millions. We might add the loss accruing to employers through drinking employees, such as imperfect work, accidents, delays, etc., these would be millions more. We might add the destruction of 30,000,000 bushels of grain, etc., but we will leave this to the reader. Adding together simply the figures we have given we have more than 950,000,000 of dollars. Now add to

this the direct liquor bill of the nation and we have the enormous sum of more than 1,800,000,000 of dollars. We cannot form any adequate idea of that amount of money. It would build and equip a double-tracked railroad around the globe at the cost of 75,000 dollars per mile. It would buy every horse, cow, mule, hog, sheep, goat, chicken, etc., in the United States. It would buy every church, school house, charitable and public institution in the country. It would almost buy every thing raised on all the farms in the United States in one year, for all the farm products, consumed, sold and on hand in 1879 amounted to but 2,213,402,564 dollars.

But these figures do not tell the story of the curse of the liquor industry. They say nothing about the tears, the heart aches, the shame and suffering of the hundred thousands of women and children. We can approximate the awful drain upon the resources of the country, but the great book of God's reckoning alone can reveal the sorrow and the awful wrongs caused by this terrible industry. If I were to attempt to draw a picture of this festering sore upon the fair face of our God given country I could not do it so well as it has been done by others, hence I prefer to give their pictures. Senator Windom, ex-Secretary of the Treasury, a man well qualified to speak on this subject has drawn this picture: "It is estimated that there are 200,000 saloons. Their proprietors, together with the distillers, brewers, etc., make, at a low estimate, an army of 500,000 persons. They employ a capital usually estimated at one billion of dollars. Its annual income is estimated at 900 millions. If we allow each of these saloons a frontage of 22 feet we will have a solid row on each side of a street of over 400 miles long. If they were formed into a city they would make eighty streets of five miles each, or twenty-five square miles of territory covered by nothing but saloons. Add the dwellings of the saloon keepers and we get some thirty square miles more. Add the haunts of vice, the outgrowth of drink, the houses of the gamblers, drunkards, cut-throats, plug-uglies and base politicians, and we have one hundred and twenty square miles of houses, with a population of 2,900,000; a city of the size of New York, Philadelphia, and Brooklyn combined. A city without a church,

a Sunday school, or a single good institution. A city in which 100,000 drunkards die annually, and the mere taxes levied for the support of paupers, idiots, maniacs and the rest amount to more than 100,000,000 of dollars. Such is the picture of the horrid city it would be. Would it were a fact and not a picture that all this iniquitous business could be shut away in one city, and not left to fester in every city, town and school district in the land, poisoning their life and washing away their substance." Gladstone, England's greatest and grandest statesman, a man who has had every opportunity to observe the effects of the liquor traffic, says, "The desolation wrought by strong drink is greater than that of *war*, *famine* and *pestilence* combined."

But the suffering, the loss of wealth and the loss of life, do not yet tell the whole tale of the diabolical influence of the saloon in our country. It has wound its slimy and slippery length around the ballot box, the representative, the senator, and other public servants.

We may sneer at the temperance question and try to ignore it, but it is the all-important question of the day for our country. Beside it tariff and free-trade are pigmies; they are like a kitten by the side of a Jumbo. This question is upon the people of this country. It will not down. It must be solved in some way or other. It threatens, if its evils are not abated, financial ruin as well as moral disintegration. The cry of hard times *means something*. The strikes and mobs show that we are sailing towards anarchy and ruin. What is the matter? Where is the secret of this unrest, this discontent among the laboring population of our country? The Fourth of July orators tell us that we have the grandest and most highly favored country under the circuit of the sun. And they are right. And yet in spite of this glorious country there is continual complaint. What is wrong? Some answer tariff, some free trade, some monopolies, some labor unions, some interference with the ballot box, some this and some that. It puts me in mind of a story I once read about a farmer and his hogs. A farmer had a lot of hogs, of a good breed too, which would not fatten on milk. He gave them ever so much milk every day and yet in spite of all

they got poorer continually. He thought those hogs had some new and strange disease of some kind. He made them a subject for an article for an agricultural journal. A veterinary surgeon thought it a very strange thing and determined to look into it. He went and viewed the hogs. They were a sorry looking lot in spite of the milk. He climbed into the hog pen to investigate, and lo the mystery was solved—there was a large crack in the hog trough. If we would merely stop the leakage we could banish hard times in spite of all these ailments about which the politicians harp so much. They are merely indications of disease, they are not the cause of the disease. We must distinguish between industries that are beneficial and profitable to the country and such as are evil and destructive. This country can no more live half drunk and half sober than it could half slave and half free.

What excuse is there for permitting such a deadly business to have free course? We legislate against diseased meats, bogus butter, tramps, thieves, prostitutes, etc. Why not legislate this out of existence? Certainly a state that has the right to defend itself against some enemies has the right to defend itself against every enemy. But says one, If you destroy this industry you destroy the government's greatest source of revenue. Now is it not a pretty state of affairs when a government goes into partnership with the robbers of itself? Why, if the people of the United States used no liquors they could pay this 90,000,000 dollars of revenue and still be better off by 1,700,000,000 of dollars. A committee of liquor dealers once visited Mr. Gladstone to protest against the agitation of the temperance question in Parliament. They said, "If you permit this to go on where will you get your revenue?" Mr. Gladstone straightened up and said, "Gentlemen, do not give yourselves any trouble about the revenue. Give me a sober people and I will raise the revenue."

But there are many who admit all this in reference to the liquor business, but they say, "Its no use, you can't do anything with it, you might just as well leave it alone."

Is it really true that the people of these United States have an evil upon them with which they are afraid to grapple? Since when have the people who arose so grandly to put down the

usurpation of the mother country and to crush the life out of the monster slavery, become such cowards? All that is necessary is for those who love their country to arise and say, This accursed business must stop! And it will stop. It will be a long time before another minority will undertake to rebel against the will of the majority. Impossible? Why with this American people, who have made so many grand achievements, not anything in the line of the bettering of her people ought to be deemed impossible.

ARTICLE VII.

THOUGHTS ON WOMAN'S EDUCATION.

By Mrs. J. H. W. Stuckenberg, Berlin, Germany.

Controversy as to whether woman's mind is equal to that of man is an idle use of time. Men and women never can be rivals in the spheres of their highest activity, since these are so widely different. Heirs of nineteen Christian centuries, and members of a nation working out some problems the old world never seriously raised, we have but to open our eyes upon what women have brought to pass in the Church, the schools, the mission work, for temperance and other reforms, to be awakened to the vital question, What training makes the most of a woman? In America our pedagogic literature no longer asks whether she is worth the highest cultivation, but whether, far as that has advanced, it is building on the right foundation. Meanwhile the best institutions of learning open to her and the great, practical organizations she is managing are affording women of power a training that will fit them to grapple with this problem of transcendent importance. It is not good for man to be alone God decided, and he made woman to help. He entrusted her with powers that help, it seems,—in a far wider sense than man or woman has dreamed in any age. Man's helper—giving him being, laying the foundations of his character, exerting influence pre- and post-natal that is supreme in his formative years; she is his sister, his cherished ideal in the love of his

youth, his wife, his daughter, his friend. What a spiral of influence winding him round and about from the womb to the tomb, subtle, strong and powerful, a part of it God appointed, a part self-chosen. But one question on earth is more important to a man than what woman shall be, and that is what he is himself.

But as the German Bible expresses it our knowledge is *Stueckwerk*—fragmentary. Our striving is toward completion but how to attain we know only in part. When God finished his human being he called him good. Then came the ravages of sin and made man *Stueckwerk.* How shall we attain completeness? Our topic deals with woman's completeness, an essential to human completeness. How shall the home and the school and the Church build her up body and spirit until she is fit to fulfil the chief end of her being, having knowledge, righteousness, and holiness, "to glorify God and to enjoy him forever?"

Let us seek an outline of the subject in its entirety. It is not because she is to be a housekeeper, or a teacher, or an artist, but because she is to be a woman, that she needs high training of all her faculties, all her powers, and according to the scale of their comparative value. It takes body, soul and spirit under consideration, and the aim is to develop a strong woman harmonious in her powers. The body has a few months the start of the perceptible soul life, is the case and instrument of all its powers, and a weighty factor in human life. Its highest development results in health; commonly that is taken to mean mere painless existence with a certain degree of strength, when not only these but vigor, elasticity, the power of endurance and the joy of life are necessary to its perfection. To attain and preserve it includes more than the wherewithal to feed and clothe the body, so that all its parts may assume due size and proportions; more than the mere chemistry and activity, it also requires the right action of the soul and spirit from which it may receive abuse or benefit. In regard to this so much depends upon woman's knowledge and skill that instruction upon the subject of health should form an important factor in her education. Her care and study here might render important aid in the development and promotion of its science, a great need of the world. We not only need a few women trained as physi-

cians and nurses but we need among women universal education concerning the nature, needs, the use and abuse of the body. And not mere theory but practice—education known by its fruits, evident in their own bodily health and in that of their family.

Again, to keep the subject in its entirety, it must be taught whereunto. The evil world strives to keep women ignorant except as to her bodily advantages. The world as it becomes Christian awakes to the advantages of her soul and spirit.

We find in the soul, intellect, emotion and will. And we find in education the main culture directed to the intellect, or rather to occupying a few faculties of it with external things; while with but slight exceptions the emotions and the will are left to the cultivation of circumstances. Pretty much all effort has run into intellectual culture, and the learned world takes a pause and inquires whether even that is pursued with the best means and the right aims. We heap to ourselves knowledge and when acquired discover that we have not gained the mental power to employ our materials. Knowledge is power; but not unless it is energized and employed. It is the material with which to construct systems if the mind itself is a master-builder. No, knowledge is only means, not power. Cultivation requires and accumulates knowledge as the citizen, money. Alas that both make the fatal mistake of making the means an end! Our schools do not always correct it; we are taught for the sake of the thing learned which is sometimes immaterial, when we ought to be conscious of being trained to acquire power to learn, to perceive, to compare, to judge, to arrange, to remember, to keep the sweep of our entire mental horizon and to extend it. So taught, we should in time gain a comprehensive view of self in its relations, should arrive at the meaning of what God in the beginning called "good."

We also need to know how to study. Where is that taught? It is a pity that so much time must be wasted until the lesson is self-taught. An account of the place each branch used as a discipline occupies in the system of education pursued, is the right of the learner. Even baby life is now being scientifically observed to discover if possible the period when the various

faculties awake. During our school years our educators ought to be cognizant of the expansion, and of the periods of comparative strength, of the reason and memory so as to adapt the scale of studies to the right exercise of these faculties. When we have learned to use our five senses, have attained a certain vocabulary, and have acquired the art of reading, we have the key to all the external world can reveal to us, or men communicate. Throughout our lives we can only go on sharpening our powers of observation, increasing our stock of ideas and becoming more interested in their history through books. Education should stimulate to extend the mental vision far as the eye can read, and to read correctly. The range of our school studies has this in view, but the schools are often slipshod in their methods, besides there is no wise coöperation between the home and the schools, and scholars complete the course without any but the vaguest notion what it was designed to accomplish. Happy the capable school girl who has some Socrates to ply her with questions on all her pursuits from first to last. We are taught the structure of language, the relations of numbers, the surface of the earth, the course of historic events, the life of plants, the order of rock creation, the stars in their relations, the composition of substances around us, their forces and motion, the construction of our bodies and finally what has been observed concerning the mind and the spirit, together with the evidences of the Author and Preserver of these wonders And it is good so. We need this range through words and figures, over space and among the people of all times, in the fields and down the mines, aloft in the heavens, introducing us to the mystery of gases and forces, to the mechanics of our own wonderful machine, to the mystery of what in us is most subtle of all, so near it takes us longest to get to it, the veritable *ego*. And then at length, sitting at home in the mind, and letting the image of all these wonderful organisms pass slowly through its chamber and afford some hint of the sweep and the structure of the universe a passion will be aroused for "more stately mansions" of the soul, stronger capacities, more ability to discover and meditate upon these "thoughts of God" in his wonderful works.

To apprehend all that the being is made for, and to apprehend correctly, becomes an eager demand according as the clamor of the body is kept under. School years are so important to the woman's education that we anxiously inquire whether the range of studies pursued there is sufficient as director to that end. Is it the best adapted? Sufficient, I should say. We do not want more studies but a better quality of study, more conscious of itself. The world wants in womankind a deeper, more earnest education laid on the foundation of her Maker, one that will stretch her capacity high and deep; more study of what the Lord has made, and less of that in which the devil has had a hand. "A little learning is a dangerous thing" has more than a sportive meaning. Much learning is the antidote. However one can be "ever learning and never coming at the truth." To attain the large aim of the truth, at the close of a course at college woman's education is but just begun; but while pursuing it she ought to receive the keys and a chart of all the range of knowledge open to her, together with the inspiration to continue its investigation throughout life. Satan has a very particular interest in keeping women distracted and petty in the employment of their intervals of duty. Enlargement and strength resist him. Is it not the women receiving most inspiration from Christ who are now rising to higher paths? There are new stirrings toward self-improvement among the women of the Lutheran Church, and they had their origin largely in the missionary societies. Let completeness in herself be woman's aim and that towards which she inspires her cotemporaries.

But the very aim at completeness, this width and extent of vision, will induce her to seek out her place in the social organism, to find out the intentions of the Author in endowing women with such capacities and powers, and investing her with such relations. This woman question, however, can not be solved until there is a nearer approach of women to all that they have power to become, and then we shall have reason to hope that they will produce the theory. Involved in that nearer approach is a principle not to be overlooked. The mission of woman is too serious, her part in the world's work too important to let intellectual culture comprise all the training she receives. Let

that become thorough, and broad, and deep, as she has capacity and opportunity; but we must plead for a deeper, more earnest education, one that trains the whole soul, the character. Everywhere as culture increases and education becomes more universal, more attention is being paid to girl's education. But in Europe the higher schools for women make the mistake of placing society as the principal field of action for women and of cultivating too exclusively that side of her nature. In America her educational advantages approach those of her brother, and suffer from the same misapprehension—that education is a thing of the schools and may be completed there. Schools cannot attempt much more than the intellectual training, nevertheless the various colleges for women seem to stamp their graduates with an individual type as to maturity and character. The spirit of Mary Lyon still breathes in the daughters of Mt. Holyoke and in the institutions founded on the same plan.

The great Leibnitz made a valuable division of the subject when he was required to draw up a project of education for a prince. He desired it to include three grades; the necessary, the useful, and the ornamental. Under the head of the necessary he aimed at the qualities of the disposition, uprightness, courage, judgment, as well as other culture. The upright man he characterizes as pious, just and philanthropic; the courageous as one of heart, not easily shaken, but maintaining his freedom whatever befalls; a man of judgment will think and speak freely upon every kind of subject and not be dazzled by appearances; a man of culture will observe what is respectable, avoid all that gives offense without which characteristic he would not be fit to appear in the society of his peers. The wise man laid the greatest stress on the cultivation of the spirit, placing even for a prince the study of statesmanship and the military art in the second, or useful grade. In his third grade of completeness, he included enlightenment on history, geography, genealogy, law, theology, agriculture, mathematics, the fine arts, the secrets of nature as revealed in chemistry, medicine, in fact in every kind of profession. "For," he said, "a prince has much leisure to devote to enjoyment, and it is better he should take pleasure in these beautiful kinds of enjoyment that are realities

to human life than in things that are frivolous, not to say, shameful." To his mind the great benefit of wealth was the ability to gain time through the help of others. And time was to him the most precious thing in the world, properly the life.

His scheme of education for the gifted princess Sophie Charlotte of Hanover, and her daughter, the first queen of Prussia, included a very careful training in philosophy, a pursuit in which they took the keenest delight.

What requirements should we call necessary to the pefection of woman, needed whether other training is included or not? Needed all the more because it is growing easier every day to make a certain amount of social display, but becoming harder and harder for people in whatever circumstances to do well by their children. We want, as the result of training, women who are noble, strong, independent, industrious, with character and understanding harmoniously cultivated, the personality developed to its highest intensity. The root of all human culture is religion; we want its life to pervade all its branches. In many lives there is a lack of unity, and the secret may be traced to its many gods. Teach girls to behold what is magnificent and great in the world, but above all do not neglect to also make them see the good. In spite of many of the classics, in spite of modern literature and life let them see that love and humility are more exalted than qualities whose glitter is more apparent to the uncultivated eye.

By their fruits ye shall know them. Look at educated women and see whether the results are what they should be, in what respects they are models, or a warning. Consider them not only as individuals, but relative to their homes, what kind of daughters, sisters, wives, mothers they are, relative to society, to their fatherland, to entire humanity. Lives contribute proof whether their training is being directed according to right principles, and whether it has been brought to a satisfactory degree. Returning to the many-sided philosopher whose counsel was sought on all subjects, I think what he says concerning princes applies in kind to what we want in woman. "In any case I prefer an old Duke Earnest of Gotha, who devoted himself to the

administration and care of his state, which he found in a ruinous condition as the result of long wars, and which by means of industry he restored to prosperity; who kept piety and righeousness foremost in mind—I say, such a prince I prefer to the most accomplished ruler in the world, even if he did understand all sciences, and all arts; were master of all languages; had adopted the fine manners of the foreigners; and shone in brilliant conversation, but was negligent in attending to business and the welfare of those entrusted to his care; and who for the sake of not having his amusements disturbed stuffed his ears that he might not hear the cry of the wretched, or be moved by the reproaches of his people or the rebuke of his family, accordingly letting his state go into decline. A great king has furnished a lamentable example."

No matter what relation a woman may sustain from daughter to mother, to contribute to the family welfare becomes an early trust; and it is only in size and not in degree that the family and its concerns can be accounted small as compared with the affairs of the state. The powerful influence wielded by women over the race in infancy, over the female part of it through their lives, over the male part especially during youth does not decrease with the progress of the times. Complications keep the husband and father more busy, more away from home, and the mother has more responsibility and influence to wield than ever before. The Jesuits understand the importance of her sphere, they try to usurp it. It urges the question as to the qualities requiring training in the regent of a family.

For these necessary elements of education the school cannot be the principal educator, the home is the most important of all, and the church its indispensable ally. At the head of the attainments worthy of education I would put love. Love developed into a habit of general benevolence; the love that is happy in the bliss of others, or that makes the bliss of another one's own. Applied to God as an object love is the perfection of piety. Suvern, of the Prussian ministry, told the young men whom the government was sending to Pestalozzi, at Yverton, that the object of their mission was "not to acquire the externality of Pestalozzi's method, that was but a weak exhalation,

or precipitate, of his spirit and idea; nor to acquire his skill in teaching, but just that they might warm themselves by the holy fire glowing in the bosom of that man of power and love." Pestalozzi's power lay in the purity and nobility of his personality and his love for humanity, he was wholly free from vanity or selfishness even among the lowest; and herein all his efforts had their origin.

The relation of the sexes demands only two fundamental conditions: that women be matured and trained to true womanliness, and men to true manliness. Christianity knows only a qualitative, no quantitative sexual difference, a difference of equally privileged gifts. Woman needs the courage Socrates defines as "a wise strength of mind, the intelligent and reasonable fortitude which foresees coming evil and can calculate the consequences of personal acts." She also needs justice, magnanimity, love of honor, generosity, and will-power. To obtain the latter there is a hint in the following fact: deeds have the inclination to reproduce themselves and to produce habits or conditions of the will. Therefore one becomes just, magnanimous by being occupied with thoughts and feelings that enlarge and elevate the soul, generous, by large dealing. Self-discipline should be aimed at in education and is attained by attention to order, regularity, duty, right, justice, and love towards others! The strength of the power which we term will depends mainly on the constancy with which it is exercised, upon its being habitually maintained. Women need to attain confidence, independence. How much time is lost in a thousand bagatelles for want of independence of the prejudices and the fashions of her environment. It is essential to thrift of her time, her money, her strength. Industry, skill, and economy are necessary if well-being is to abound. I would also add concentration, or attention; it is that on which memory depends, correctness of knowledge and thought, and that discretion of manner without which we cannot imagine a true woman. There are enough sorrows in life without multiplying them, hence the cultivation of cheerfulness must be appended to this list. To neglect cultivating the disposition would thwart the aim of woman's happiness and of those around her. One of Goethe's characters says,

"There is one thing that humanity does not bring into the world, but one on which everything depends in order that a human being may become a human being in every respect, and that is *reverence.* Plato's complaint fits into our times and the occasion of it should find correction at the fountain head. He said, "We no longer listen with respectful silence to superior interests, but one and all are become accomplished critics, and every one knows everything. Awe and reverence have gone for ever, and there is a shameless disregard for authority whether of parents, or rulers, or elders." Recognition of authority and how to exercise it are specially important in the system of woman's education; authority of parents over children, elder over younger, mistress over servant. Harmony and obedience among the subjects of a family are necessary to its best welfare. Excess of freedom is a mischief. Wholesome law must be felt. Subordination and obedience are a necessary discipline towards attaining full spiritual stature. We need to observe and to exact it. The highest gratitude for the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free will be manifest in our revering the powers set over us by God's Word. A number of the qualities here mentioned were beautifully exemplified in the mother of two men now eminent in the Christian ministry of Germany, the court preacher Emil Frommel and his brother Max. She had been asked for the secret of her eminent success in training her boys, and modestly replied that she was not aware of having employed any other than "watching how God made good her deficiencies in training." But in one of his books, the court preacher describes in his mother several characteristics that must have been as necessary to the development of her children as this passive trust. He says: "There were two things in which she was inexorable, unconditional truth and unconditional obedience. There was no contradicting or raising opposition in her presence, and there was nothing she hated as she did a lie. She united a lofty ideal purpose with a sharp moral judgment—woe to him who should indulge in rude or vulgar words in her presence! There was something republican in her fiery nature and she recognized only one authority, but to that she bowed herself. Never was a truer heart. What she recognized as true in her conscience she

fought through with all energy despite every obstacle. Many a time her punishment which was swift to descend upon an offender fell upon the wrong boy, but always then her keen sense of justice led her to seek pardon of the victim, which, because of her spirit of fairness, was speedily obtained. She knew no fear of man. And so it was that she nurtured and steeled in us respect for authority, and at the same time defiance for the merely arbitrary, hatred for all that is vulgar and ignoble, independence of will—in a word she gave us character. Father used to say, 'Children, if you amount to anything it is your mother you have to thank for it.'" The world needs women who will feel all their duties and have skill in fulfilling them; needs their advantages of disposition, their understanding, their practical adaptability, their energy of feeling and will, and their tact in the treatment of all those under their charge, as in all social relations. These are all made more efficient by training and of that there is sore need. Take for instance the great cry of inefficient servants; it is an evidence of inefficiency in training and treating serving people. There are other factors, but the principal one is to be laid at the door of the housewives. Whence shall any good, or elevation, come to young servants if not from their employers? The desired fruit must be rightly cultivated. As we behold, schools have little opportunity for the general culture of morals and feeling; for this purpose they are far from being well enough planned and advanced; besides, the course of education there is too soon broken off. What these leave undone wise women ought to be ready to take up and complete, both, for young mistresses and servants. There is responsibility for something more than simply getting the required labor out of completely inexperienced and easily befooled young domestics. Despite socialism, labor unions, and the manifold outside interferences will women rise to this question? Strange that the whole complicated subject of woman's relations to people, outside of certain superficial directions for display in society, is so neglected in instruction. It is not the problem for men, hence the women of eminent gifts in this line and of special experience have the responsibility laid on them for the discovery of its principles and their being inculcated; let them

impart their methods and their spirit. Because theirs is bread labor, governesses, kindergardeners and teachers seek skill and training; ought not mothers also to seek models among mothers? When the distinction between the important and unimportant shall be kept in mind it will work great reform in the course of pursuits. That will excite carefulness to seek instruction wherever special responsibility is laid, and will shape woman's education to herself, her own higher needs. Throughout girlhood she will seek all that fits her to become the highest human being, at the same time she will be growing aware of her provinces and taking kindly to the education that will fit her to be a sovereign there, to her own credit and the good of humanity. As enlightenment proceeds perhaps some of the studies women now pursue may be dropped, for in their own good time new and more important ones ought to take their place. In all matters pertaining to definite perceptions of the right relations of individuals, to control of persons, Germany has an advantage. Here, where nearly every man is a trained soldier, recognition of authority, unhesitating obedience, and military courtesy, are so general as to be a constant object lesson whose influence permeates all grades of the people. Children and those under authority submit with a better grace where they see such examples of obedience and deference in their superiors. Among the more cultivated classes insubordination is so quickly nipped in the bud as to be a rare spectacle. Laws regulating the non-essentials of life, so that these can be speedily disposed of, create time for the important things. Every German woman of position and education is expected to be a thorough, consistent disciplinarian, even in society. A hostess will not spare rank, man nor maiden, when anything due to her, or her guests, is forgotten, though the reminder usually comes in words selected by the gentlest tact, but always sufficiently plain. Frequently, young girls who have completed their school studies and a course under their own mothers are sent to spend months in assisting ladies eminent in directing their own households and society, that they may thoroughly attain the art of management of an establishment.

A new country like ours where wealth is so rapidly accumu-

lated affords great advantages to the children above their parents. They become more than the heirs of an added age. Right here a partial education may produce results to be deplored. If with the superior intellectual culture there is no harmonious culture of the heart, it may produce the revolting spectacle of children manifesting impatience and chagrin when they ought to show gratitude, and haughtiness where they ought to yield honor and reverence. A writer in a German journal says, "Children are taught too much and trained too little, they learn so much they ought not, so little of what is necessary to life. A boy of capacity may acquire sufficient knowledge to become an eminent minister; but not the moral strength to withdraw calmly and retire into private life. Youth is taught to become rich, but who teaches the more difficult art of doing without riches, to be satisfied with little and still to rejoice in his existence? Every art is taught which is to result in making one's fortunes, but how is it with the art of bearing misfortune nobly when it comes. In a word we are not trained in the art of living. We are directed to the religious teacher, who does all that one can reasonably expect when he impresses religious teaching on the memory and causes it to be intellectually grasped. But drill in the moral laws is a matter for the home training only; the home should go hand in hand with the school, further its activity and support, but how seldom is this the case! In practical matters *to know* is nothing, but *to be able to do* is everything. * * We are rich in great scholars, critics, and officers, but we are so poor in great characters." If the home is to teach these most necessary things, who in the home is to do it? Frommel's testimony is repeated by most great men—they have their mother to thank for what they amount to. O the teaching a woman needs for the important offices she holds in life; the pity that so many well considered marriages become unfortunate because young wives are not capable of performing their duties as they would certainly wish, and all simply for the reason that they are ignorant and cannot adapt themselves, and not because they are badly disposed! The new generations of girl scholars coming fresh from our colleges have a lofty mission in a field where thoughtful, learned men have been expending their best

energies and are not yet content with what they have produced. The helpmeet for man is needed also in the search after the laws of nature in humanity and education; thought from her standpoint has already been a leavening power. Many of the reforms we are enjoying to-day, and others now occupying gifted men and women, were first suggested by Mary Wollstonecraft, a century ago. A soul conscious of unused powers needs to feel that it occupies a place of grave importance to stimulate it to its best. Much more progress might have been made in the right direction if woman had not been depreciated until she came to think derogatorily of her own powers. So long as she retains this feeling there will be a tendency to think meanly of the special duties assigned to her as to those belonging to an inferior being, and requiring only limited powers and strength to perform them. Surely she must soon arrive at the discovery that her sphere develops the best gifts of a human being, and would enlarge the highest powers.

Special work has opened for educated women, and they have an evident call to organize departments of labor helping to solve the social problems now agitating the nations, and sweeping through their own doors. Bearing arms for their country seems rarely in the world's history to have been woman's mission, but there are foes even more dangerous to a nation than having a Napoleon for a neighbor. The woman warfare "For God and home and native land" that had its origin in that strange outpouring of the Holy Spirit manifest in the Woman's Crusade now enlists the largest organization of women that ever was seen, is generaled by the wonderful Frances Willard, and has been raging for fourteen years. Who suffer the most desperate wrongs from the liquor interests? No wonder with such a foe threatening the home on every side, that women seek to obtain every weapon it would be right for her to wield. Woman's mission is a home mission preëminently. She creates, preserves, and helps to defend, the home. But home has a wider meaning than four walls, or a narrow heart, can compass, and woman is responsible for purity and wholesomeness throughout its domain. Hand to hand conflict with the saloon, and with social impurity, has taught the W. C. T. U. the importance of its educational

work. Considering what little children are, fresh from the hand of God, what they might become if only men and women were wise enough to take proper care of them, our educated women are realizing with a satisfaction never felt before that to make them and their education the great study, whether as mothers, teachers, friends, or trainers, is a great and lofty occupation for their lives. The general dissatisfaction and criticism concerning the curriculum in high schools and universities arouses the query whether there are not departments of knowledge awaiting a woman's brain to classify and construct. When women have learned what men can teach, can they not leave off trying to walk in their footsteps and following their patterns? The highest development of womanhood will help the highest development of manhood most. Learning to think and feel after the truth occasions the question whether there are not realities in life which God wants women to reduce to a system. There is so much confusion in social and domestic affairs. Perhaps it must remain so until women give up trying to think men's thoughts in a manly way; come to themselves, are at home in their own minds and characters, and then from the highest cultivable woman's stand-point marry their woman's thoughts and deeds to man's for the increase and multiplying of wisdom, goodness and happiness in the world. If through observation it can be established what forces and powers develop in the first years of life this will add great importance to woman's mission. There is need of an Aristotle among women; work ready to hand would be a theory of woman's social relations, a psychology for women, that whole neglected subject of the emotions outside of aesthetics, and work on ethics. The catechism states the aim of training to be "That they may do their duty in that state of life to which it hath pleased God to call them." Let girls have equal advantages with their brothers, and behold in the result God's theory concerning them; it will be manifest in what they will be able to make of themselves.

The useful, the ornamental, and the necessary, in education interlace according to the object of their attainment. What may be simply an accomplishment to the private student may

be an essential to one destined to earn her bread. Merely filling the memory with knowledge and sharpening the understanding, useful, necessary as it is, often shows as a result a benumbing not only of the immediate feeling and of the judgment concerning the right, but also of the impulse and of the natural energy; at the same time this half-education imparts the supposition that it must have produced the capacity to judge of everything, often leading to making infinite individual demands that are opposed to the great moral order. It was in consideration of this deplorable result that so much stress has been laid on that which develops the will and the ethical powers of the soul, and on such direction of training as will fit for some definite, practical pursuit. At the same time, we have seen that the sort of work for women demands also the highest powers of intellect brought to the highest working capacity by the best training. Looking along history what a difference it has made who were the teachers; where were Plato without Socrates, or Aristotle without Plato, or Alexander the Great without Aristotle?

Among mental disciplines one of the most instructive, broadening, and inspiring, is the study of history if pursued with reference to its general outlines, from its beginning to the present, dividing the subject according to its natural development to be afterwards filled in with more complete and detailed accounts as opportunity offers. How it helps in every study if you know its history! The memory may not retain all details, but certain ideas and impressions remain, calculated to awaken others in case of need, and at least render the mind susceptible to all that offers itself on that subject. Let the scope be the world's history from Egypt to the present, even if concerning it much more may never be learned than is offered in "The History Primers" edited by J. R. Green. System in all study keeps before the mind the totality of a subject, it leads to the attaining of its principles and the learner is kept conscious of what she does not know on that subject, of itself valuable information and an incentive to further investigations. To return to history in general, there is a famous fresco in the old museum in Berlin which suggests a method that may be a valuable aid to the memory in matters of historic detail. It is Kaulbach's "Era of the Refor-

mation" and it represents, and groups in appropriate place, all who were most distinguished in that age in the several departments that affected culture. Luther is the central figure, and near him are his great Wittenberg colleagues distributing the Lord's Supper. Behind, occupying a gallery above, are the precursors of the reformation, Wickliffe, Huss, Savonarola, Waldus, and others; to the left, in a niche, are the great artists of the time, Raphael, Michael Angelo, Leonardo di Vinci, and Dürer; nailing to a column a specimen sheet is Gutenberg, the inventor of printing; standing below, are Erasmus, and other eminent scholars; seated to the left, at the foot of the picture, are the great authors of the age, Shakespeare, Dante, Cervantes, and several German authors, with Hans Sachs humbly occupying a seat on the floor. Noted warriors are here, Ulrich von Hutten, Franz von Sickingen; on the right hand, at the base, stands Christopher Columbus beside a globe, explaining to the famous geographers and explorers what astonishes them visibly; above in the right niche, are the great astronomers, Copernicus with his map of the heavens, Tycho Brahe, Kepler, and Galileo; grouped beside the column there stands Queen Elizabeth, the greatest monarch of her times, and grouped about her, her brilliant court. Designing similar pictures mentally of all the great and admirable in any age, keeping trace of their relation to the general progress, and of nation to nation and to the world's history, will thus map out indications of all that is most worth knowing that has transpired on the globe..

An eminent astronomer said that the pursuit of his science enabled him "to think the thoughts of God." In all education there is one source of revelation greatly neglected, the scientific study of God as revealed in the humam being. The comparative value of Greek and the higher mathematics to the more serious study of philosophy as a discipline should be gravely considered. It would be profitable to devote much more attention to logic, psychology and ethics. Here again the subject should be presented in its entirety so far as philosophy has been developed, a comprehensive Introduction to the Study of Philosophy should form the stepping stone. But to gather materials of thought without growing in power of expression would

be to thwart one of the objects of scholarship. Mastery of at least one's own language with its best literature is indispensable to a complete education. The study of Latin is of such value in the comprehension of English, and in acquiring most modern tongues, that conscientious study of it is great gain. I would have women know much; it is the way to the realization of how little she knows or her brothers can attain; it is the way to the modesty, humility, and thoroughness, needed to help allay this world's confusion and bring it to an appreciation of the worthiest and best, the one thing needful.

The place and importance of the fine arts in the development of our powers may well make us hesitate to place them wholly in the category of the ornamental in education. Plato wanted music included in the system of education, simple, ennobling music chanting the noblest thoughts. Bach, Haydn, Beethoven, Händel, and Mendelssohn, have opened new avenues of the soul for the awakening and the expression of the noble and beautiful in feeling. As the study of music is generally pursued it is not a means of intellectual culture, and often its most skillful expression is prostituted to other than high moral uses. But there is an immense range in musical composition, some of it sin cannot touch, it has been consecrated; and this, largely the grandest and the best, should be commended to the student. Germany has a few musical schools devoted to this class of compositions, and to church music. Such should also find a home in America. Joachim was once directing a chorus which was rehearsing the vocal part of the ninth symphony, and I heard him say, "When you want to interpret Beethoven you need to bring a collected mind and heart. You cannot turn from your chatter and reveal what the master had in his soul." The mission of music is so soothing, inspiring, and uplifting that all who have an opportunity to learn to sing, or play, *musically*, have a call to diffuse its sweet spirit.

We have only to observe a woman in whom the aesthetic feelings lie dormant to wish that she would respond to "Whatsoever things are lovely * * think on these things." The love of beauty is something inherent in woman; for her contentment and self-respect let her not violate it. Let her be

taught which beauty is highest in degree, as well as in kind,—cultivate in all essentials her taste. Charm of manner, purity and beauty of speech, are all 'to be thought of.' Paul's idea of things lovely ascended the gamut, culminating in the beauty of holiness. To please and to charm is no unimportant aim of cultivation if it is made an end of becoming the means of a high calling, to reveal the spirit of Him who grew in favor with God and man every day, the One altogether lovely.

ARTICLE VIII.

MIDLAND COLLEGE—THE GROUND OF ITS CLAIM.*

By M. RHODES, D. D., Pres. *pro tem.*

"In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.—Col. 2 : 3.

I place this comprehensive utterance of Holy Scripture at the beginning of my remarks more as a fitting motto than as a text, for what I shall say may be styled an address rather than a sermon. At the same time I regard it as eminently appropriate, for I profoundly believe that it contains the fundamental principle upon which alone the Christian college can be reared and maintained. In establishing Midland College upon a proper basis, and with a promise of success about which there can be no question, the very first thing to be done is to lift the crown to His head who is the source of all wisdom. These words do not furnish us with a figure, but they distinctly announce a most important fact. The treasures of that wisdom and knowledge which are adequate to the highest needs of men and nations, and which are worthy of your attention and mine, are hidden in Christ,—not from us, but for us. It is singular enough and at once a motive and an encouragement for all engaged in this good work that history bears ample testimony to the truth of this statement, as it stands related to the cause of proper education. Our great country is not cursed, neither is our wonder-

* An Address delivered in Atchison, Kansas, in the Presbyterian Church, on Lord's Day evening, Sept. 11, 1887.

ful civilization hampered nor hindered by those men in the high places of church and state, as well as in the lower spheres of human life, the roots of whose knowledge strike deep in the fathomless wisdom of the Son of God, and whose spirit and aim seek to exalt him as the one rightful king over all. I deem this intimation of the trend of my remarks as the more important not only because this is the first public utterance in behalf of the institution we are about to establish in this city, but because of the marked tendency in this secular age of ours to divorce religion and higher education. This suggests one of the most vital questions now challenging the attention of thoughtful men—the question as to whether education shall be purely secular, and so, partial and injurious; or whether it shall be moral and religious as well, and so, complete and beneficial. Quite more than is realized, I fear, the destiny of the rising generation, and of this great country of ours depends upon the right solution of this mighty problem. We want wisdom and knowledge of the highest type, wisdom and knowledge the most varied and helpful in all the pursuits and walks of life, and if we will have that which will serve best, and result in the largest return to ourselves and others, there could be no greater mistake than to ignore the Fountain-Head. Touch the subject of education where you please, and apply it as you may, it can only achieve the best and the most when it has regard to Him "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." But in the eager exciting search, this is just what the secularist would have us ignore. His theory is that we are to look for the gold, but elsewhere than in the mine. His view is wholly inconsistent, it is hampered with both limitation and peril, and however fair it may seem, the result in the end will be found to be worse than failure.

It is not my purpose now, however, to enter into any elaborate discussion of the relation of all useful knowledge to that which the Church has ever rightfully regarded as supreme, nor to point out the distinction between the secular and Christian in education, except as they may incidentally occur in what I shall say. The time will come as we advance for the notice of these and kindred topics, for this subject of education is one of vast

proportions and one which is deserving of the most careful attention of the three great factors in our civilization, namely, the Home, the Church, and the State. For the present, however, it will be fitting and enough that I present some of the grounds upon which Midland College may lay claim to the helpful interest and patronage of the city and State in which it is located. An institution like that in whose behalf we have met to-night, and which you have yourselves invited with eager interest and very commendable generosity, must not only have a reason for its existence, but a substantial ground of appeal as well. This much you have a right to expect, and this much we hold to be peculiar to the college that is distinctively Christian.

Before I advance to the points I desire to emphasize, it would seem fitting to say a word respecting the Church under whose auspices this institution is founded, and by which it will be controlled. I am aware that as a mere matter of information it need not be said in a presence like this, that the Lutheran Church is an educating Church, but it may be said as a testimony to the great cause represented here to-night, and as some token of what may be expected in the time to come. More I am sure than is generally known the ministry and the educators of universal Christendom are indebted to the universities of the fatherland which bear her name. The Lutheran Church both in this country and in Europe has always recognized this high function as no small part of her mission. The right sort of learning was not only one of the agencies in the achievement of the great Reformation, but also one of its most effective results. With the liberation of conscience came the emancipation of intellect; when the shackles of ignorance and superstition were struck from the soul, the mind asserted itself, and began that untrammeled acquaintance of useful knowledge whose brilliant march has come to be one of the wonders of the ages. The Reformation not only declared that Galileo was right, but that henceforth the brain of Galileo should be free to discover and demonstrate truth in every sphere no matter what doctrines of men it overturned. The Church we have the honor to represent comes with no boast nor exclusive claim, but she believes that light is liberty, and that no cloud should be permitted to

keep it from the humblest child; she believes that truth is to be sought in every sphere and that it is the heritage of the race, as free as the beams that fall from the sun, or as the mountain spring that leaps over the cheek of the rock; she believes that if God does not need our learning, he can as little get on with our ignorance, and that the greater the intellectual resources, if properly applied, the greater the results for good, both to the individual and to the community. I own with gladness and gratitude that the other communions assembled here to-night hold these views in common with us, and their own efforts in behalf of Christian education in this land furnish ample testimony to their fidelity and success in the great cause. What I have said I have said with conviction, and because I feel that it is quite as due to you on this occasion as it is appropriate in this address.

What now are some of the grounds on which Midland College proposes to commend itself to the sympathy and patronage of this city and community?

First, history bears ample testimony to the fact that such an institution is of greatest value to the commuity and State in which it is located. Midland College has as yet no history to furnish testimony to its worth, nor will gratuitous adverse prophecy and unbelief, ever help it to any such history, but there are numerous other like institutions, commenced under far less favorable auspices, whose achievements enable us to speak with intelligent conviction. Besides, this institution is by no means a venture; it represents principles true and tried, that in themselves warrant success, and it has an aim uplifted, and underneath which are the Everlasting Arms. There is much in a right beginning, and in this we have endeavored to be prayerfully vigilant, and we would be treacherous to our faith in God, if we expected little instead of much. I affirm that such an institution is of incalculable value to the community and State to which it belongs. Take the smallest Christian colleges, those that must struggle to survive, and I give it as my belief based on stubborn facts, that they are very fountains of blessing to the communities that possess them.

In this secular age many men are wont only to look for suc-

cess on the surface. They see it only in that which can be piled up, counted and insured from the flames. It is strange, but true, that the superficial and the perishable make most impression upon the minds of many; they forget that the greatest and most imperishable forces for good are concealed and silent. The thought may be applied with great force to the Christian College. To those of you who look below where the dust gathers, it will be seen by and by, that in Midland College you built better than you knew.

The college furnishes useful public men to the state. And just this the Christian college should do, for the state is the institution of God. "It is an ordinance of the King of kings, established for high political and moral purposes; and it claims, under the limitations of rectitude, supreme allegiance and universal homage." To give to the state men worthy of the responsibilities the state demands and the distinctions it confers, is at once one of the highest duties and best testimonies to the worth of the Christian College.

It does this *by strengthening and enlightening the mind.* With ever expanding range it imparts knowledge, and provides for all the useful vocations of life men who have not only been taught to know, but to apply wisely and well what they know. There is not a calling of human life that is not more or less hampered by lack of knowledge, and the perplexity that comes to men in business and enterprise, and the hardship and misery that wear and waste great multitudes of people, are due very largely to the incompetence and utter lack of aptitude which come of ignorance.

An institution with a just conception of the possibilities of the human mind, and with the very highest aim of human life as an impulse, that puts light in the place of such darkness, is a blessing to the state that can never be estimated by any material value. Mark, what I emphasize, that it is the function of the Christian college, over against the secular, to conceive rightly of the possibilities of the intellect, and of the loftiest aim of life, and it is because of this, that the Christian college must stand preëminent in its worth to the state. But the college

builds character as well as illumines the mind. Surely, to mere culture there is limitation; human wisdom and salvation are a long way apart, yet there is something in it, especially when imparted with such an end in view, that refines, that is conducive to manliness, self-reliance, self-respect, and self-restraint, elements of character, you will admit, most essential to proper citizenship, and to any position of trust. There is an atmosphere in college life, especially if the college be Christian, that follows the student, like those hallowed memories of home, which to some of us are as the angels of God.

But keeping our thought on the worth of such an institution to the state, there is undoubtedly that in a collegiate education which fosters the true spirit of liberty. The mind is brought into contact with the master spirits of antiquity, and these for the most part have been champions for freedom. Let a young man stand in the right place and face toward the right goal, and the inflow of knowledge will open his soul to the great truths and laws of the universe, and he will acquire that amethyst of human character—I mean *reverence*, and at once he will rise to a stirring conviction of the dignity of his nature, and the great possibilities of life. In every battle for liberty, whether in the wrestle for knowledge, the advancement of enterprise and invention, in the legislative hall or on the field of carnage, the college man has stood in the front rank and wrought well.

More than is generally supposed, and more than is known by those who fling contemptuous ridicule on colleges and college men, the college is represented in the high places of state, and in all the prominent vocations of life.

Here is a statement taken from official records, which happily fell into my hands while preparing this address, showing most conclusively the advantage of a college education to the aspirant for the high places of trust in the state.

Of the Presidents of the United States 65 per cent. have been graduates. Of Vice Presidents 50 per cent. Speakers of the House of Representatives 61 per cent. Members of the United States Senate 46 per cent. Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, 73 per cent. Chief Justices, 83 per cent. Cabinet officers, 54 per cent. The general average of these is 59 per cent.

Add to these those who have left college before graduating, and it is estimated that college-bred men occupy fully 75 per cent. of the places of honor and trust in the government. The same advantage in favor of a collegiate education would appear were we to examine all the prominent professions and positions in human life. Midland College has yet to make out her catalogue of eminent public service; but we are hopeful and believe that this institution in due time will produce an honorable proportion of manly and capable men in the executive, legislative and judicial departments, and in all the public professions of human life, and of women not a few, whose names will not stand second in the high places to which God is calling the daughters of the land to-day.

Such an institution is of great value to the state because of the healthful influence it must exert on the schools and other benevolent institutions supported by the state. The Church not only recognizes the right, but also the duty of the state to educate. Being itself a divine institution, for "the powers that be are ordained of God"—the state is bound to do what will promote the public good. The state has its poor-houses, and hospitals, its prisons and reformatories, its army and navy, but the institutions that bless the commonwealth, and conserve her liberties and prosperity, are her colleges, academies and common schools, along with her churches. Every man knows that if ignorance could be banished from our land, a very large amount of the pauperism and crime that waste our resources would go with it. Upon all those institutions which the state has established and maintains for the public good, the Christian college exerts a beneficial influence, and in this day, unquestionably, there is need of it, for not a few, to whom parents commit their children to be educated, scorn the thought with which I began this address. This in my judgment is both to ignore the true origin and high purpose of the state. It is wholly unpatriotic and inconsistent with every true principle of citizenship. The Christian college freed from narrowness and bigotry occupies higher ground, it is unhampered by such hurtful inconsistency; it looks to the pupil's highest well-being for his own sake, and for the sake of the position he is to fill; it contemplates the elevation

of the lowest and of the poorest, and comes to favor and supplement every means the state has adopted for such an end. The salutary influence of the Christian college pervades society, it gives tone and right direction to public opinion, and by the very principles on which it is founded, and the lofty purpose at which it constantly aims, it is always a reliable testimony on the side of public virtue and morality.

But especially, I hold, does the Christian college sustain a helpful relation to our common and select schools. Besides furnishing a large number of competent teachers, such an institution imparts a worthy ambition, and supplies enlarged opportunities to the pupil, without which not a few would be limited, if they did not fail altogether in their life-mission. These different schools, distinctive in the manner in which they vary, are reciprocal, the one helps the other, we need all of them, but every thoughtful man will see how free from those injurious influences which the state finds it difficult always to guard against, the Christian college is, and hence its preëminent value as an educator. There is no aspect of the case, which if fairly considered, will not discover the very great advantage of the Christian college to the community and state. I fear the people of this already great State of Kansas little realize the part they are to play in the future of this country through these educational institutions. When I look down upon the youth and realize how they are to be moulded by those who educate them, the question to me is a momentous one, and I thank God for any institution of learning that will underlay and engird itself with such a principle and purpose as are suggested in the word with which I began. I come not with pretense of flattery when I affirm that those of you who have had any part in this commendable undertaking, will not have occasion to blush for your place in the history of Midland College when it shall be written. Midland College, it will be seen is a good and grand gift to a generous city and a great State, better than the regalia of power, better than the trophies of war, better than the achievements of enterprise or all material treasure, or any monument of human ambition.

Secondly—Midland College will aim to challenge your sympathy and patronage on the ground of *thoroughness.*

I count it a good omen that we have come upon a time when there is a manifest weariness of pretense. The day for the merely ornamental and superficial in education is passed. The college henceforth is not to be judged by the number of its students, but by the work it does. Life is becoming more and more real; every great force in our civilization is responding to a general demand for the practical and the useful. This is no day for sham. More than ever education is to be acquired in order that head, hands and heart may be fitted to the world we are in, and the life we are living. This is just as it should be. It will rightfully be the high aim of Midland College to do thorough work. We have no greater desire than that this institution shall have a worthy witness in every pupil it graduates. A college to do its work must be possessed of adequate facilities; it must have a corps of competent instructors, each man as nearly as possible a master in his department. In an eminent sense its faculty must illustrate manhood, represent learning, and possess conscientious skill to impart it.

But in such a statement I would have you bear two things in mind. The faculty and appliances of a college may be the best, but it requires more than this to do thorough work. The parents, the people, the pupils, the Church has much to do with it. There is no place where it is more difficult to make bricks without straw than in a school of higher education. There is no invention yet that will enable a college professor to put brains where there are none, and if the child has never been taught subordination and application in the home, it will be very difficult to secure these in the college when the child becomes a student. A man may be very skilled in touching the keys of an instrument, but what of it if the instrument furnishes nothing? We must not look for the unreasonable, especially while we ourselves withhold the reasonable. I grant you, you have a right to demand and expect thorough work, but keep the mutual conditions in mind.

Remember also that a school like that which we are about to establish in this city, must not be expected to leap into mastery

at one bound. A college is never born full grown. To bring Midland College to the ideal we have set for it will require a large outlay, the labor, and patience and accumulation of years. The full equipment for Midland College will come,—come as it is wise it should—gradually. Princeton, now one of the first institutions in the land, began with no building, no endowment, no professors, no permanent site, and with only 20 students. Its first graduating class numbered but six. Since then, by that gradual growth, for which we shall labor and pray for our Midland, see what God hath wrought.

Let me indicate briefly something of what we mean by thoroughness. In our view, education contemplates not a part, but the whole man. The time has passed, I am glad to believe, when in a thorough education, there shall be no regard for the *physical.* If man has a mind so has he a body; it will avail little that the intellect is brilliant, if the body be enfeebled. It is far from lost labor to teach young men and young women to walk erect as God made them, to make them familiar with the laws of nature, and to hold up in very clear light the certain penalty that follows their violation, to recognize their distinction over lower creation, and their solemn duty to show that human life is not a waste and an indulgence, but a resonant psalm, an inspiration of God that should fill us with gratitude and high hope, and a sublime opportunity to be used for the highest ends; to teach them the peril of all pernicious habits to the physical constitution, and the holy dignity God has conferred upon the human body, not only in its shapeliness and beauty, but in that he has been pleased to make it the temple of the Holy Ghost. Admirably adapted, I think, is the location of Midland College, with its elevated site, its large campus, and splendid view of valley and hill and river all about, to conduce to health. From its walls we shall hope to send out hosts of young men and women, not wilted like leaves in autumn, but fresh and strong like flowers in spring-time, ready for life's battle, and answering to an adage too often forgotten in procuring an education—*Mens sana in corpore sano*—A sound mind in a sound body.

The next thing contemplated in thoroughness is a disciplined

mind. This means more than cramming, getting through, or memorizing. It means for the mind what the discipline of the athlete means for muscle. It means vigor, robustness of intellect to grapple with the difficult, far more this, than so much knowing in a particular branch. It means what never comes of incompetence in the teacher, and indolence in the pupil. It means the power of concentration, the ability to keep our way, until we have gotten through some particular labyrinth of knowledge. It means not only the ability to see the gold in the quartz, but also the power to break the rock, get the precious metal out and put it into current coin. Students never come to such thoroughness by light reading, but by severe patient application, helped wisely by those who have been over the way before them. Midland College will spare no pains to send out young men and young women, not painted on the outside, but each possessing the gift of a disciplined mind, for it is the disciplined mind that is to do the world's great work in the time to come.

But thoroughness consists in more than mastering the textbook. Man has more than a physical and a mental part. No system of education, nor effort to attain it, is worthy to be called thorough that neglects the moral and spiritual. Just here, as we shall see, all purely secular education is put at serious disadvantage. Undoubtedly the broadest, most philosophical conception of education includes the whole man. The late Mark Hopkins, who for a half century occupied a first place as a Christian educator, spoke with unanswerable force when he said: "If man is to be educated physically and intelligently because he has a physical and intelligent nature, why should he not be educated and trained morally and spiritually because he has a moral and spiritual nature? * * If men are to be trained to be strong in muscle, why not strong in the Lord? If to wrestle with each other, why not with wickedness? If to carry on mimic fights and boxing, why not to fight the good fight of faith? If to gain the crown of victory in contests with each other, why not an 'incorruptible crown?' If to run races in the gymnasium and on the campus, why not to run the race that is set before them in which they are 'compassed about with so

great a cloud of witnesses?' Why, in short, if they are to be trained in bodily exercise that 'profiteth little,' should they not be trained in 'godliness that is profitable unto all things?'" When this broad view ceases to be the conception of thoroughness in Midland College, her mission will have ended and her glory will have departed.

This leads me to say in the third and last place, that Midland College comes to commend herself to the sympathy and patronage of this city and of all the States in the West by the *moral and religious principles* on which it is founded.

It will be agreed by all that that which distinguishes a Christian College, whilst it should never be narrow nor offensive, should at least be marked. No investigating committee should be required to determine the character of such an institution. There is a demand now, not that sectarian tenets, but that Bible truth and Christian principles be emphasized in education, and it is not without significance that the demand should have been aroused by the tendency to divorce the secular and the religious in education, to which I referred in the beginning. I have intimated that it is the right and duty of the state to educate, but if in exercising this function the state aims to promote the public good, it would seem a contradiction to ignore the moral and the religious in the method. The argument sometimes advanced that for the state to link the religious with the secular in education is at the same time to be sectarian, is fallacious, indeed it is not an argument at all, it is a pretext. I am convinced that there are serious difficulties in the way of the state, in this important matter, and, indeed, it is a question with me whether the state is competent to engage aright in the work of higher education. At the same time, do not the arguments which go to prove the right and duty of the state to provide for the education of the people, go to establish the right and duty of making that education the very best; in other words, both moral and religious?

But however this may be, there can be no kind of question as to the position of the Christian college in this particular. It must be Christian throughout, without pretense or reserve. If Midland College is to have the blessing of Almighty God, if it

is to become great for the Church, this city and State, then the principles upon which it is based, and the spirit, example and purpose which are to characterize its conduct, must be in keep-in with the mind and truth of God. This is our avowed testimony in the beginning, and we feel confident that it will commend itself to this community. A school where the young are trained is a most sacred place, and of all places it should be freest from irreligion. The Christian college must have a Christian code, a Christian atmosphere, a Christian example and a Christian aim, and this distinction must never be compromised for any profit or consideration whatever. I am certain I express the profoundest conviction of the Board of Education, and of the faculty, and of the entire Church represented, and I will believe of this audience, when I say that the fondest hopes entertained in behalf of Midland College repose in the fact that God and his word are to be honored in it, and that his kingdom is to be promoted in this city and in this world of the west by it.

Let me state briefly some reasons for this feature of our College, which we emphasize so strongly. I affirm a good reason in the fact that there are colleges, especially in the west, which take care to ignore this feature. They claim the right to educate, but not in the whole range of the faculties. They contend that the foundation of manhood may be left to others, or disregarded; and that it is enough for them to look after the ornamental top. So, some men show wisdom in building a house, but the utmost folly in their methods of building men. Such an influence can only be counteracted by taking higher ground, and offering equal and greater advantages. This is not only demanded by all the sacred interests of home and Church, but by the state. Religion is not only the hope for the soul, but it is the only safe-guard for the great social and political interests of the commonwealth. Sound morality and wholesome culture sustain an intimate relation to national thrift. No man without hoodwinking his conscience and reproaching his reason can scorn this truth of God—"Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." Christianity is the greatest civilizing, moulding, uplifting power on the globe; it is more

than a set of dogmas, it is a life, a perfect character revealed in Jesus Christ, who is the head of the race and the peerless teacher. It is not the secular, but the Christian college which comes to witness for Him, and to lift His palms in blessing upon the nation's life.

Again the Christian college comes to supplement the functions of family and Church. Who will question that the family and the Church should be Christian? The first institution moulded by the touch of God, not excepting the Church, was the home. There is no more sacred place, no spot on earth that engirds such possibilities as the hearth-stone. Of all places on earth it should be, may be nearest heaven, resonant with its music, radiant with its light. The very reasons that emphasize the need of the moral and religious in the home and in the Church emphasize their need in the college. Midland College is to have all needed facilities by and by; let the first book lifted to the shelves of its library, the book most of all revered, be the Holy Bible, and we are ready to predict that every youth that goes out with its sanctifying touch, will go out to bless the world.

But the college should be Christian in order to improve the quality of our science and culture. These are great forces for weal or for woe. Clutched by immorality and infidelity they are stolen weapons, used often with skill, and always to the serious hurt of the unwary. Christianity owes much to both science and culture; science and culture owe much to Christianity. There are evil tendencies prevalent to-day, the natural outgrowth of science and culture where pursued for unworthy ends, and regardless of religion and the higher needs of man. It is the lofty privilege of the Christian college to overcome these evil tendencies and to bring science and religion together in becoming and helpful fellowship. The Christian college, its over-arching dome filled with heaven's own light, is the temple of both.

Of course, while Midland College, as the representative of the Lutheran Church of the General Synod, will hold to distinctive views, it will be Christian without being sectarian. This College will not assume to control the consciences, nor to determine the ecclesiastical relation of its students; it will stand stoutly, not indeed for that liberalism which regards any or no Christian be-

lief as a matter of indifference, but for that Protestant liberty which is man's high right, and God's own gift. We distinguish between a theological seminary where the dogmas of a particular denomination are taught, and a Christian college offering advantages of a liberal education to all. Christianity will be taught in Midland as bearing upon character and life without being sectarian. This can be done, and I say with conviction, it should be done. I cannot better close this part of my address, upon which I have barely touched, than by a quotation found in a religious journal, from Dr. Porter's last Baccalaureate before the graduating class of Yale College. No one, I am sure, will venture to charge this learned and godly man with fanaticism or lack of experience when he says, speaking of religion in the College: "That it should be wisely Christian need not be suggested; that it should not undo by overdoing is self-evident; but that Christian aims should animate and control its life, is equally manifest. We confess that we cannot understand the logic nor the practical wisdom of those who admit the propriety and necessity of positive Christian influences in the home and seminary, but would omit or exclude them from the college. The reason which they give is that the pupil is no longer a child, and therefore, should be treated as a man. It is true that he is no longer a child, and, perhaps, not a youth; but neither in character nor in convictions has he become a man. Moreover, just at this period of life he is doomed to pass through that fermenting and transition period in which he must form for himself his practical convictions and his theoretical judgments in the light of independent thought. It may be that less can be done in a formal way for either at this time than at any other. It may be, and doubtless is true that officious and ill-timed intermeddling will do more harm than good; and yet, for all that, there is no time or condition of life in which wise Christian influences are more needed, or are more effective than when the spontaneous impulses of childhood and youth are confirmed or rejected by distinct acts of intelligent volition—the judgments of the growing man." Brave, noble words are these, the words of a master, fit to be inwoven with the ground principles of every Christian college in the land. On these grounds, my friends,

we come to claim your sympathy, your patronage, and your prayers. With these principles and these aims we come to give impulse to all that is good and beautiful in your midst, to reward the interest and generosity you have manifested, and to furnish you just cause for gratitude and commendable pride in the time to come.

Joined in heart and hand let us count that we have done well in laying a foundation so broad and stable for Midland College, and that the heavens are already opened in blessing upon our work, because we seek to associate "Jerusalem with Athens; to intertwine the ivy of Parnassus around the cedar of Lebanon; and to weave with the wreath of flowerets plucked from the vale of Tempe, the rose of Sharon;" that we may now, and hereafter in our visits to and festivals on yonder hill, "remember, that among the hills of Palestine there is a hill of tenderer interest and higher hope than either Ida or Olympus." Thus we return to the point from which we started, and lift again the crown to His head, "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge."

ARTICLE IX.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.—*Sermons*, by Jas. R. Woodford, D D., vol. I. on subjects from the New Testament, vol. II. on subjects from the Old Testament. *Sermons*, preached to the Harrow Boys in the year 1885 and 1886, by the Rev. J. E. C. Wolldon, M. A. *Christianity, Islam, and the Negro Race*, by Edward W. Blydon, LL. D. *The Psalms in History and Biography*, by Rev. John Kerr, D. D. *A South Window*, or Keep Yourselves in the Love of God, by George F. Pentecost, D. D. *Social Aspects of Christianity*, by Brook Foss Westcott, D. D., D. C. L. *The People's Bible*, Discourses on the Holy Scripture, by Joseph Parker, D. D. *Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. Edited by Philip Schaff, D. D., LL. D. *Atonement*, Review of "Atonement and Law" by S. G. Burney, D. D., LL. D. *Is there any Salvation after Death?* by E. D. Morris, D. D., LL. D.

SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL.—*Sociology*, by John Bascom, LL. D. *Elements of Physiological Psychology*, by George T. Ladd. *History of*

Modern Philosophy, by Kuno Fischer, Descartes and His School, Translated by J. P. Gordy, Ph. D., Edited by Noah Parker, D. D., LL. D. *Of the Doctrine of Morality in its Relation to the Grace of Redemption*, by Robert B. Fairbairn, D. D., LL. D. *System of Christian Ethics*, by Dr. J. H. Dorner, Translated by Prof. C. M. Means, D. D. *The Science of Thought*, by Max Müller. *Philosophy of Theism*, by Borden P. Boune.

HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL.—*Ancient History*, from the Dispersion of the Sons of Noe to the Battle of Actium and the Change of the Roman Republic into an Empire, by Peter Fredet, D. D. *The Story of the Life of Queen Victoria*, by W. W. Tulloch, B. D *Martin Luther*, His Life and Works, by Peter Bayne, LL. D., in two volumes. *A History of the Baptists*, by Thomas Armitage, D. D., LL. D. *Life of Leo XIII. from an Authentic Memoir*, by Bernard O'Reilly, D. D., LL. D. *Reminiscences of James A. Garfield*, by Carydon E. Fuller. *Henry Wadsworth Longfellow*, His Life, His Works, and His Friendships, by George Lowell Austin.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*Woman, First and Last, and What She has Done*, by Mrs. E. J. Richword. *Methods of Church Work*, by the Rev. S. Stall, A. M. *The Pleasures of Life*, by Sir John Lubbock. *The Christ in Life*, by J. L. Batchelder. *The Gospel in Nature*, by Henry C. McCook, D. D. *Beecher as a Humorist*, Selections from Published Works of Henry Ward Beecher, Compiled by Eleanore Kirk.

ARTICLE X.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY, NEW YORK.

Scenes in Southern India. By Mrs. Murray Mitchell. With numerous Illustrations. pp. 372.

No one can read without a pleasurable interest these sprightly pages of one who describes with the freshness of an eye-witness the scenes of an extended missionary journey, who speaks with all the sympathy of a woman's heart and with the intelligence afforded by a long experience among the India missions. Those who believe in Foreign Missions, who labor and make sacrifices for this cause, will here have a confirmation of their faith and an ample compensation for their efforts, while those who are skeptical on this subject will find their doubts melting away, as the ice yields to the warm sunlight of spring. The transformation which is being effected by the Gospel in India is simply marvelous. The story of it as related here seems more wonderful than the golden dreams of fancy Yet its truth no one denies. Books of this character

ought to go into all the Sunday School libraries. And blessed is the family that relishes and appreciates such literature.

Universal Beliefs; or the Great Consensus. By Rev. E. F. Burr, D. D., Author of "Ecce Coelum" etc. pp. 312.

With all the diversity of religious beliefs there are certain cardinal convictions which are common to all religions and which in a measure "make the whole world kin." Among these fundamental truths which have been universally embraced are those of the existence of Superhuman Beings, a Supreme Deity, earthly Providence, Religious Worship, Efficacious Prayer, Infallible Oracles, Immortality, etc. This does not cover the whole scope of the gospel, but one cannot read this volume without recognizing the universal soil which has been prepared for the Gospel, which is after all, the one religion called for and in a measure foreshadowed by the great and indestructible truths in which all nations and all ages have believed. To fight against Christianity is in effect to make war upon the common faith of mankind. The reading of such a work is well calculated to promote firmness of religious conviction, and it were well if a wide circulation among skeptical minds could be secured for it.

ANSON D. F. RANDOLPH & CO., NEW YORK.

The Evangelical Revival in the Eighteenth Century. By John Henry Overton, Canon of Lincoln and Rector of Epworth. pp. 208.

The subject of this monograph is a movement whose incipiency really antedated the societies founded by Wesley, while its compass extended far beyond the Methodist organization and its results are still visible in both England and America. In the judgment of the author, who has made a careful study of this era and who writes with the spirit of fairness and candor, the glory of "originating the Evangelical Revival" belongs to William Law, a high-churchman, who had indeed "no sympathy with the course which the fire took," after having thrown the spark that kindled it. The influence of the Moravians is acknowledged. "The religious societies supplied a body to Methodism, the Moravians a soul." But it is surprising to find no recognition of the impulse which came from German Pietism in the Lutheran Church.

A clear distinction is drawn between the Methodists and the Evangelicals, the latter confining their ministrations within parochial limits, the former preferring the system of itinerancy and practicing various irregularities. "All Methodists would have wished to be called Evangelical, and all Evangelicals, whether they wished it or no, were called Methodists."

The chapter on the "Literature of the Revival" will have peculiar interest to many. Wilberforce's "Practical View," Hannah More's works and some others were stamped with such intrinsic merit that they furnish to-day a good example of the 'survival of the fittest,' but

even the sermons of John Wesley "as specimens of pulpit oratory cannot for a moment be compared with those of our great classical preachers, such as Jeremy Taylor, Barrow, or South." "As to George Whitfield's sermons, it is unfortunate for his reputation as a preacher that any specimens should have been preserved." The specific merit of the preaching of these immortal divines consisted evidently in their adaptation to the distinct end of preaching. The thoughtful will derive not only historical knowledge but a great deal of real profit from the reading of this little work, which is written in a clear and strong style.

HARPER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

Introduction to Psychological Theory. By Borden P. Bowne, Professor of Philosophy in Boston University, Author of "Metaphysics." pp. 329. 1887.

Prof. Bowne stands in the first rank of American writers on psychology and metaphysics. He is there by the merit of what has come from his pen. Uniting a healthy conservatism with true independence of thought his discussions represent to an unusual degree the line of genuine progress in the department of psychological inquiry.

The work before us sustains the author's well-earned reputation. It is not offered as a systematic psychology. It essays no regular classification of the mental faculties. But it discusses the principles of the science and aims, by an analysis of the psychical facts, to discover and present the true psychology of the different powers. The work is therefore, as its name imports, truly introductory to the elaboration of a psychological theory, settling the various troublsome questions which the student of the science is obliged to meet. The conception and the execution are marked by unusual originality. The author's plan did not require him to deal much with the physiological conditions or attendants of mental action. It is gratifying to see that he does not concede the exaggerated importance claimed for these by the "new psychology" in the settlement of the facts or the principles of psychology. He well says: "The study of the physical conditions of our mental life has a pathological and practical importance; but it does not promise any valuable psychological results, at least for those who can distinguish between the physical conditions and the mental facts which they condition." Nor does the plan include the *metaphysics* of the science. The problems which this would raise are beyond and subsequent to the ground-work here sought in the actual basal facts. The whole work is divided into two parts: The Factors of the Mental Life, and The Factors in Combination. Under these the discussion runs through The Subject of the Mental Life, Sensation, The Mechanism of Reproduction, Cerebral Theory of Reproduction, The Thought Factor, The Feelings, Will and Action, Consciousness and Self-consciousness, Perception, The

Forms of Reproduction, The Thought Process, Interaction of Soul and Body, Sleep and Abnormal Mental Phenomena.

These topics, it will be readily seen, require the author to discuss almost all the questions of psychical fact and principle which enter into the determination of psychological theory. The discussion everywhere exhibits the author's familiarity with the history of the science, the fulness of his resources, the clearness of his insight, the soundness of his judgment and mastery of the materials. The chapter on the subject of the mental life is a fine example of acute, clear and vigorous analysis and argument. As a brief refutation of the claims of materialism or the view which leaves the mental states without a mental subject, we know of nothing equal to it. By an equally clear array of evidence, the chapter on the process of reproduction is made an annihilating exhibit of the inadequacy and absurdity of the sensational and associational theories of memory. The cerebral theory receives a special examination and its "grotesque whimsies" pass under a most trenchant exposure. The examination into the nature and action of the thought factor is a clear and strong showing of the utter fallacy of the explanation of empiricism, and full evidence of the origin of the *a priori* ideas of Time, Space, Cause, Substance and Attribute, etc., from the direct and necessary activity of the mental subject or rational self. Some features of the discussion of this topic, however, are less satisfactory. The author's positive explanation seems in some respects to be indefinite and ambiguous, if not misleading, particularly as to the real genesis and the validity of these ideas in their primary character. Though he allows that these stand for objective reality, some of his ways of representing them are not adapted to assure the veracity of the mental principle which establishes them. He speaks of them as "products" of the mind, "contributions" of the mind. The mind is represented as compelled "to give its objects spatial forms and relations, rather than that it views its objects under the form of space because they are in space. All this will seem to many to be an unnecessary concession to the Kantian subjectivity, and a needless introduction of a rupture between being and knowing. It may, indeed, be said that this point is to be settled not by psychology, but by metaphysics. But there does not appear to be any need that psychology, even under guidance of the author's own order of thinking and explanation, should intrude the suggestion conveyed by this mode of statement. The rational principle may be more justly and consistently represented as intuitively perceptive of what *is* than as possibly creative of what may only seem to be.

An appendix is added to the chapter on this subject to show the relation of the doctrine of evolution to the explanation of the thought-categories. The sensational and associational psychology has taken great comfort and tried to get aid from this doctrine. But the searching analytic of our author lays bare the fact that the vaunted hypothesis of

evolution while, on the one hand it surrenders the argument of sensationalism on its old ground, on the other furnishes no solution out of its own resources.

But we need not extend this notice. Waiving all points of criticism, Prof. Bowne has here given a work of great ability and rare value. It is one of the books which give and mark progress in true science. Though called an 'introduction' it is, however, not a book for beginners. Its discussions can be rightly appreciated only by such as are to some degree acquainted with the problems of psychology. But to advanced students and instructors in this department, it will be found exceedingly rich and profitable. M. V.

The Russian Church and Russian Dissent. Comprising Orthodoxy, Dissent, and Erratic Sects. By Alfred F. Heard, formerly Consul-General for Russia at Shanghai. pp. 310. 1887.

Mr. Heard has traced in this volume the development of Christianity in Russia from its prehistoric traditions to the various sects, and the stirring religious movements which characterize the Muscovite empire of to-day. The great doctrinal and ecclesiastical problems of the past, and those of the present, along with their relation to the national life, are brought under review in a way to engage the reader's attention and to enrich his stock of knowledge. In the course of reading these pages one also gets some insight into that strange paradox that a people whose "strongest and most general characteristic is religious devotion," should be exceedingly slow to emerge from the state of barbarism. With a nation to whom "form and ceremony alone constitute religion," the force of divine truth can in the nature of things make but feeble progress.

It is a disappointment to find this volume restricted to the Established Russian Church and the dissenting sects which have sprung from its bosom. The most notable religious feature of Russia, at the present time, is the heartless and wicked persecution which the 4,000,000 Lutherans in Finland and the Baltic provinces are suffering from the Imperial government. But it does not appear to have fallen within the purview of the work to notice either the Lutheran, Roman Catholic, or Jewish communions, which constitute so large a portion of the Tsar's subjects. But for this defect, which is not a slight one, it must be recognized as a fair compendium of the diversified and seething elements which are working out the destiny of the Slavic race. It is intended for the general reader rather than for the specialist, but the philosophic mind will be struck with its suggestiveness on ecclesiastical subjects in general. It is written in a lucid, lively and sympathetic style, compact in form, marked by a judicious, unpartisan temper, and bearing throughout the stamp of a real contribution to literature, as certain of popularity as it is of permanent value.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO., BOSTON AND NEW YORK.

For Sale by J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia.

The Appeal to Life. By Theodore T. Munger, Author of "Freedom of Faith." pp. 339. 1887.

Mr. Munger is among the foremost religious writers of the day, a sincere, thoughtful, earnest exponent of living truths, throwing over old themes the charm of freshness, stimulating the reader to further inquiry and awakening in him somewhat of the independence of judgment which distinguishes the author.

The "Appeal to Life" means an attempt to present the truth "set in the light of daily life and the real processes of human society," in other words to subject religious thought to the inductive method. The themes of the discourses are such as "The Witness from Experience," "Christ's Treatment of Unwilling Skeptics," "Truth through and by Life," "Trust and Righteousness," "The Twofold Force in Salvation," "Faith Essential Righteousness," "Evolution and the Faith," &c., &c.

We are glad to see the vital truths here discussed go forth in a form so striking, sprightly and beautiful as to secure extensive reading, but we heartily regret that misinterpretations of both scripture and life also seriously impair the soundness and value of this volume.

Take for instance, the treatment of faith as essential righteousness. That faith is the source of righteousness, that it involves "a moral quality and force that ensure righteousness" is a most important truth, but to teach that God accepts you because you do so trust him as to show that you have a moral quality, to teach that faith is counted for righteousness because it reveals a real righteousness, is equivalent to denying that the sinner is saved purely and solely through the mercy of God. Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners. He himself testified that he did not come to save the righteous, yet here we are taught that because of the essential righteousness which inheres in faith "God counts one worthy." This is not the way of salvation revealed by Paul and expounded by Luther. The appeal of the Publican was directed to the mercy of God, the moral quality present in his faith did not come into consideration, yet he was justified. God saved him, a sinner, because he is merciful, and not because the wretched man had first attained to an inherent moral quality in his faith.

It may be added here, too, that these champions of a new theology would improve our opinion of their theological simplicity and single-eyed devotion to truth, if they would somewhat check their propensity to exaggerate the conflicts and errors which marked theological parties in the past. Those opposing schools may have turned passages from Paul to a use he never dreamed of, crowded them with meaning that he did not intend, and made them the rallying cry of theological champions, and a very body of divinity. But we are still waiting to see evidences of a different disposition among the "new" theologians. So far as the

reviewer's reading extends, they have about as much party spirit and prejudice, about as much human infirmity and inclination to read their own preconceptions into the Scriptures, as there ever was among the much-abused Arminians and Calvinists.

The Exeter Lectures. Lectures delivered before the Students of Phillips Exeter Academy, 1885–86. By Presidents McCosh, Walker, Bartlett, Robinson, Porter, and Carter, and Rev. Drs. Hale and Brooks. pp. 208. 1887.

The Trustees of the Exeter School were right when they judged that these lectures were adapted to a wider service than that accomplished in their delivery. Dr. Hale speaks of Physical, Mental, and Spiritual Exercises; Dr. McCosh, of Habit and its Influence in the Training at School; Dr. Walker, of Socialism; Dr. Bartlett, of The Spontaneous Element in Scholarship; Dr. Carter, of The Sentiment of Reverence; Dr. Robinson, of Men, Made, Self-made, and Unmade; Dr. Porter, of The Ideal Scholar; and Dr. Brooks, of Biography. These lectures are replete with important truth and counsels, adapted to the young, and put in form to interest and influence them. The scholarly lecturers knew how to throw vivacity and sunshine through the addresses. The book ought to go into the library of all schools and academies and colleges and be read by the young. M. V.

The Poetic and Dramatic Works of Robert Browning. In six volumes. Crown 8vo.

Vol. V.: *Red Cotton Night-Cap Country*, Aristophanes' Apology, The Inn Album, Pacchiarotto, and How He Worked in Distemper and Other Poems.

Vol. VI.: *The Agamemnon of Æschylus La Saisiaz*, The Two Poets of Croisic, Dramatic Idyls, Jocoseria, Ferishta's Fancies and Parleyings. With an Index of First Lines and General Index of Titles.

These two volumes complete this superb "Riverside Edition" of Browning, noticed in our last issue, an edition which being an exact reprint of the poet's latest revision greatly surpasses previous American issues, and which is sure to be added to every good library.

Browning may not have as wide a popularity as some of our own sweet singers, like Longfellow and Whittier, but the scope and dignity of his conceptions, his vigor of thought, his love of liberty, his dramatic power, his rugged humor and tender pathos, his Christian theism and refined morality command for him one of the foremost positions in the alcoves of modern literature, and insure him an abiding fame.

Each volume can be purchased singly, being so bound as to be complete in itself. Few, however, who will look upon the charming set with their own eyes will resist the temptation to purchase the whole edition. And proud will be the student whose purse can compass such a possession.

The Gates Between. By Elizabeth Stuart Phelps. pp. 222. 1887.

Miss Phelps is no mean theologian, though never making much pretense to orthodoxy. Like her "Gates Ajar" and "Beyond the Gates," the present little work will hardly improve her reputation in this line. She does by no means confine herself to what is written, and in her imagination of the Hereafter seems to have no fear of the anathema with which the volume of revelation closes. This latest product of her pen accords with the eschatology of the so-called "New Theology," and as a work of fiction is a fitting illustration of that fictitious annex to the truth once delivered to the saints. It is, however, to thoughtful readers a very entertaining tale, marked by that bold fancy, exalted range of sentiment, exquisite language and suggestive power which distinguish all the works of this brilliant authoress.

JOHN B. ALDEN, NEW YORK.

The Life of Jesus according to Extra-Canonical Sources. By Rev. Bernhard Pick, Ph. D. pp. 189. 1887.

This is the first attempt to combine from the apocryphal gospels a connected and continues account in English of the life of Christ. There are about fifty such gospels, besides a great number of other spurious apocryphal writings, of no historical authority, and denied by the Church any place in the list of canonical books. Dr. Pick has prepared this work after the plan and arrangement of Rudolph Hofmann's *Das Leben Jesu nach den Apokryphen.* Thirteen pages of notes follow the body of the book, containing references to the writings from which the narrative is compiled, and such other literary matter as may be interesting to students. The work has been done with care and discrimination, and will prove of much interest to those who desire to form a connected view of the representation which these spurious writings present of the life of Jesus. M. V.

Historical Sketch of the Jews, since the Destruction of Jerusalem. By Rev. Bernhard Pick, Ph. D. pp. 46. 1887.

This small volumes gives us an excellent outline view of the fortunes of this dispersed and wonderful people. It will be helpful to the student who wishes to get a clear and related view of the summit points in their history, into just connection with which his after reading may unite and associate the abundant facts and details of fuller historical works.

M. V.